HARṢA AND HIS TIMES

HARṢA AND HIS TIMES

[*Thesis approved for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy by the University of Jabalpur.*]

By

Dr. Baijnath Sharma, M. A., Ph.D.,

Head of the Department of Postgraduate Studies and Research in Ancient Indian History, Culture & Archaeology, University of Jabalpur

With a Foreword by

Dr. Raj Bali Pandey, M. A., D. Litt.

Vice-Chancellor, University of Jabalpur.

1970

SUSHMA PRAKASHAN

VARANASI

FOREWORD

I have genuine pleasure in writing a few lines by way of foreword to "Harṣa and His Times" by Dr. B. N. Sharma. It is a critical reconstruction of a very important theme of Ancient Indian History. Harṣa marked a watershed between the Imperial History of India with all its glories and shortcomings on one hand and the dynastic, regional and feudal history of Ancient India which met a disaster on the eve of Muslim invasion on the other. It was almost a meteoric revival of the imperial tradition of Indian History, but it amply blazed for a considerably long period of Harṣa's reign. Conquests and administration organised by Harṣa gave a definite shape to the social and cultural life of the country. The author has ably dealt with both political and cultural aspects of Indian History under Harṣa. It was not an easy task, because the brilliance of Harṣa's achievements has attracted a large number of distinguished historians. Dr. Sharma has benefitted by their contribution but has also made distinct and valuable contribution to the development and maturity of his important theme. His treatment of political, administrative and social life and cultural aspects is more comprehensive than that of the previous authors. Dr. Sharma has taken great pains and exercised immense patience in collection of materials and has evinced a critical and judicious acumen in his performance. In my opinion this work is a valuable and solid addition to the existing fund of knowledge which has grown round the historic career of Harṣa.

I heartily commend this work as a notable product of critical and comprehensive scholarship to all readers who are interested in Ancient Indian History and Culture.

Raj Bali Pandey

To the Sacred Memory

of

PADMABHUSHANA PANDIT KUNJI LAL DUBEY

the Founder Vice-Chancellor, University of Jabalpur.

FOREWORD

I have genuine pleasure in writing a few lines by way of foreword to "Harṣa and His Times" by Dr. B. N. Sharma. It is a critical reconstruction of a very important theme of Ancient Indian History. Harṣa marked a watershed between the Imperial History of India with all its glories and shortcomings on one hand and the dynastic, regional and feudal history of Ancient India which met a disaster on the eve of Muslim invasion on the other. It was almost a meteoric revival of the imperial tradition of Indian History, but it amply blazed for a considerably long period of Harṣa's reign. Conquests and administration organised by Harṣa gave a definite shape to the social and cultural life of the country. The author has ably dealt with both political and cultural aspects of Indian History under Harṣa. It was not an easy task, because the brilliance of Harṣa's achievements has attracted a large number of distinguished historians. Dr. Sharma has benefitted by their contribution but has also made distinct and valuable contribution to the development and maturity of his important theme. His treatment of political, administrative and social life and cultural aspects is more comprehensive than that of the previous authors. Dr. Sharma has taken great pains and exercised immense patience in collection of materials and has evinced a critical and judicious acumen in his performance. In my opinion this work is a valuable and solid addition to the existing fund of knowledge which has grown round the historic career of Harṣa.

I heartily commend this work as a notable product of critical and comprehensive scholarship to all readers who are interested in Ancient Indian History and Culture.

Raj Bali Pandey

PREFACE

Harṣa ranks as one of the great rulers of India. He combines in him the military genius of Chandragupta Maurya, the benevolence of Aśoka, the statesmanship of Samudragupta and the englightened character of Chandragupta Vikramāditya. He has won for him much glory as a great military-general, a great conqueror and empire-builder, a just and efficient administrator, a great patron of art and culture, a man of high and noble ideals and, above all, a man of indomitable character and versatile personality.

But unlike Chandragupta Maurya, Aśoka, Samudragupta and Chandragupta Vikramāditya, Harṣa was never unknown to Indian scholarship. He was, however, first introduced to the learned world by Ettinghausen through his book entitled "Harsavardhana: Empereur et Poet" published in 1906. In 1921 Śrī Vaidya published the first volume of his "History of Medieval Hindu India" dealing with Harṣa and other contemporary rulers. The next book was Śrī Pannikar's "Śrī Harṣa of Kanauj" which appeared in 1922. This was followed by Dr. Mukerjiee's 'Harṣa' published in 1926, being his Calcutta University Readership Lecturs delivered in 1925. In 1937 Dr. Tripathi published his "magnum opus" the "History of Kanauj" and "devoted a disproportionately large space" to Harṣa in order to give "a critical account of Harṣa's administration and achievements of peace." There are several other works and a large number of articles which have appeared in various journals and periodicals and other historical studies. While going through these works I felt that several controversial issues still deserve serious rethinking and reinterpretation and, when I presented a dissertation dealing with the social and cultural history of Northern India in the first half of the seventh century A. D. for my M. A. Examination, I strongly felt that Harṣa's political gains and cultural achievements required further examination and thorough study. The present book is the result of these feelings and requirements.

The book consists of two main aspects of 'Harṣa and His Times'—his success in carving out a mighty Puṣpabhūti empire at a very critical period of Indian History, when the forces of disintegration were at work, and his various other achievements in social and cultural fields.

The first chapter of the book aims at giving an idea of the political scene beginning with the decline and fall of the Imperial Guptas and emergence of several regional dynasties and kingdoms. This, in fact, is prefatory but was thought necessary to introduce Harṣa in contemporary Indian political scene. Chapters II to VIII deal with Harṣa's military, political, administrative and personal achievements and these chapters form the first part of the book. in the remaining chapters an attempt has been made to depict the social and cultural aspects of Harṣa's times.

While dealing with Harṣa's political and military gains much has been said by way of reinterpretation of facts supplied by Bāṇa's Harṣacharita. This work has also been my important and major source of information on social and cultural aspects. It is unfortunate that very few scholars have adequately understood the importance of the Harṣacharita, a great historical romance containing tremendous amount of information pertaining to Harṣa and his times. Its author, Bāṇa, was not only, "the greatest master of Sanskrit Language", but was also a man of encylopaedic learning. The learned editors of the Harṣacharita rightly observe that Bāṇa "has woven the story out of actual events" and his masterpiece "in fact is as much based on real events as Scott's Quentin Durward or Waverley." It contains "a living and contemporary picture, wherein we can see something of the India of that time, just as we see in Arrian and Plutarch something of the India of Alexander's time." In addition to several historical details "the work has another interest from the vivid picture which it offers of the condition of Indian society and the manners and customs of the period." They further opine quite legitimately that "his descriptions of the court and village life abound with masterly touches which hold up the mirror to the time. Not even the Pāli Jātakas introduce us more directly into the very heart of the period or give us a more life-like picture. The court, the camp, the quiet villages,....and

the still more quiet monasteries and retreats, whether of Brāhmaṇas or Buddhists are all painted with singular power; and his narrative illustrates and supplements the Chinese traveller's journal at every turn." (HCCTH., Pp. VIII-XI). Similar is the importance of Bāṇa's other work, the Kādambarī, which, like Harṣacharita, was left unfinished and was completed by his son Bhūṣaṇabhaṭṭa. It further supplements Harṣacharita in several respects. Its characters display an unrivalled consistency and idealism and we can say that Tārāpīḍa's ideal rule and benevolence, Śukanāsa's unqualified loyalty to his master and his ability as a minister, Chandrapīḍa's noble qualities as crown-prince and Śukanāsa's advice to Chandrapīḍa are some of the finest descriptions of the Kādambarī which add much to our study of the period under review. These details are further supplemented by Harṣa's own dramas, the Priyadarśikā, the Ratnāvalī and the Nāgānanda. Another great man, to whom we owe much for his elaborate details, is the Chinese pilgrim Yuan Chuang, who visited India during Harṣa's times. His records are of great help to us. But as he "wanted to know only Buddha and Buddhism," his description is full of Buddhist miracles and marvels. For these reasons he could not work as "a good observer, a careful investigator, and a satisfactory recorder, and consequentely, he left very much untold which he would have done well to tell." (Watters, P. 15). We must, therefore, accept his evidence only when it is corroborated by other evidences. These literary sources are further corroborated by Harṣa's inscriptions and several other grants and *Praśastis* of his contemporaries which contain abundant material to enable us to deal with the history of Harṣa and culture of his times. All these sources "shed much light upon the political conditions of India generally, and supply, in particular, abundant and trustworthy information concerning the reign of Harṣa. . . . and when all sources are utilized, our knowledge of the events of the reign of Harṣa far surpasses in precision that we possess respecting any other early Indian king, except Chandragupta Maurya and Aśoka." (EHI., P. 348).

My indebtedness to earlier writers on the subject has been acknowledged at proper places in the book. They are too many to be enumerated here. Their pioneering works have been a source of inspiration and

valuable information to me for which I, once more, take this opportunity to offer my most sincere and thankful acknowledgements.

This book mainly represents my doctoral thesis prepared under the learned guidance of my most respected guru, Dr. Raj Bali Pandey, M.A., D.Litt., Vidyaratna, Mahamana Malavaya Professor in the Department of Postgraduate Studies and Research in Ancient Indian History, Culture and Archaeology, and Vice-Chancellor, University of Jabalpur, to whom I am so much indebted that I do not find words to express my feelings of gratefulness. He has been intimately associated with the preparation of this work right from the very beginning. In fact, I could not have completed it without his learned guidance, indefatigable help and unremitting inspiration. My wife, Smt. Shanti Sharma, M.A., deserves my most sincere thanks for constant help in preparing this book. I wish to acknowledge my thanks to Messrs Sushma Prakashan, Varanasi, for publishing this book.

As the publisher and printer agreed to rush the printing of this book at a very short notice, some minor printing errors have remained uncorrected. A corrigendum is, therefore, given in the end of the book. I hope the readers will not mind these errors.

June 29, 1970. **Baijnath Sharma**

TRANSLITERATION TABLE

अ	a
आ	ā
इ	i
ई	ī
उ	u
ऊ	ū
ऋ	ṛi
ए	e
ऐ	ai
ओ	o
औ	au
अं	aṁ
अः	aḥ
च	cha
छ	chha
ञ	ña
ट	ṭa
ठ	ṭha
ड	ḍa
ढ	ḍha
ण	ṇa
स	sa
ष	ṣa
श	śa
व	va
क्ष	kṣa
त्र	tra
ज्ञ	jña

ABBREVIATIONS

ABORI. or ABORIP.	Annals of the Bhandarkar Oriental Research Institute, Poona.
AGI.	Ancient Geography of India by Cunningham.
AHD.	Ancient History of the Deccan by G. Jouveau Dubreuil. Pondicherry, 1920.
AHS. or Anc. Hist. of Sau.	Ancient History of Saurāṣṭra by Dr. Krishnakumari J. Virji, Ph.D., Bombay, 1955.
AIG.	Age of the Imperial Guptas by Dr. R. D. Banerjee, Varanasi, 1933.
AIHT.	Ancient Indian Historical Tradition by F. E. Pargiter, Oxford, 1922.
AIIC.	Ancient India and Indian Civilization by P. Masson-Oursel and others. London, 1934.
AIOC.	All-India Oriental Conference.
AMSK.	Ārya-Mañju Śrī-Mūlakalpa.
Ann.	Annual.
AR. or Ann. Rep.	Annual Report.
AORM.	Annals of Oriental Research, Madras University, Madras.
ASI.	Archaeological Survey of India.
ASIAR.	Archaeological Survey of India, Annual Reports.
ASIRC.	Archaeological Survey of India, Reports by Sir Alexander Cunningham.
Beal. (or Life.)	The Life of Hiuen Tsang by Shaman Hwui Li, with an introduction etc. by Samuel Beal, London, 1914.
Bhārata Kaumudī.	Studies in Indology in honour of Dr. Radha Kumud Mookerjee, 2 Parts, Allahabad, 1945-1947.

Bom. Gaz.	Bombay Gazetteer.
Bṛi. Sm.	Bṛihaspati Smṛiti.
BTS.	Buddhist Text Society.
CA.	The Classical Age (History and Culture of Indian People, Vol. III). Ed. by Dr. R. C. Majumdar, Bombay, 1954.
Cal. Rev.	Calcutta Review.
Cat.	Catalogue.
CII.	Corpus Inscriptionum Indicarum.
DKM.	The Decline of the Kingdom of Magadha (c. 455-1000 A.D.) by Dr. B. P. Sinha, Ph. D. (Lond.), Patna, 1953.
DHNI.	Dynastic History of Northern India by H. C. Ray, 2 Vols, Calcutta, 1931-1936.
EHI.	Early History of India, by V. A. Smith. 4th Edition, Oxford, 1924, Reprinted in 1957.
Ep. Ind.	Epigraphia Indica.
Ed.	Edition or Edited by.
Fn. or fn	Foot-note
G.E.	Gupta Era.
Gaz.	Gazetteer
HC.	Harṣacharita of Bāṇa.
HCCTH.	Harṣacharita, Eng. Trans. by E. B. Cowell and F. W. Thomas, London, 1897, Reprinted in 1961.
HCK.	Harṣacharita of Bāṇa, Ed. by P. V. Kane, Bombay, 1918.
HCIP.	History and Culture of the Indian People Ed. by Dr. R. C. Majumdar, Bhartiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay.
HCESA.	Harṣacharita Eka Sāṁskṛitika Adhyayana by. Dr. Vasudeva Saran Agrawal, Patna, 1953.
H.E.	Harṣa Era.
HMHI.	History of Medieval Hindu India, by C. V. Vaidya, Poona, 1921.

HNEI.	History of North-Eastern India by R. G. Basak, Calcutta, 1934.
HSL.	History of Sanskrit Literature.
HS.	Hindu Saṁskāras : A Socio-Religious Study of the Hindu Sacraments by Dr. Raj Bali Pandey, M.A., D.Litt., Varanasi, 1949.
Ind. Ant.	Indian Antiquary, Bombay.
IC. (or *Ind. Cul.*)	Indian Culture, Calcutta.
IHC.	Indian History Congress.
IHQ.	Indian Historical Quarterly, Calcutta.
Imp. Gaz.	Imperial Gazetteer.
JA.	Journal Asiatique, Paris.
JAHRS.	Journal of the Andhra Historical Research Society, Rajahmundry.
JAOS.	Journal of American Oriental Society.
JASB.	Journal of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta.
JBBRAS.	Journal of the Bombay Branch of the Royal Asiatic Society, Bombay.
JBHU.	Journal of the Banaras Hindu University, Varanasi-5.
JBORS.	Journal of the Bihar and Orissa Research Society, Patna.
JBRS.	Journal of the Bihar Research Society, Patna.
JDL.	Journal of the Department of Letters, Calcutta University.
JIH.	Journal of Indian History, Trivandrum.
JNSI.	Journal of the Numismatic Society of India.
JORM.	Journal of Oriental Research, Madras.
JPASB.	Journal and Proceedings of the Asiatic Society of Bengal, Calcutta.
JRAS.	Journal of Asiatic Society of Great Britain and Ireland, London.
JRASB. (*Letters*)	Journal of the Royal Asiatic Society of Bengal. Letters. Calcutta.
JUB.	Journal of the University of Bombay, Bombay.

JUPHS.	Journal of the U.P. Historical Societ,y Lucknow.
Kād. (*or Rid : Kād*)	Kādambarī of Bāṇa, tr. by Ridding, London, 1896.
KP.	Kādambarī of Bāṇa, Ed. by Parab, Bombay, 1896.
Life.	The Life of Hiuen Tsang, by Shaman Hwui Li, with an introduction, etc. by Samuel Beal, London, 1914.
Mem.	Memoirs.
M. Bh.	Mahābhārata.
MS.	Manu Smṛiti.
Num.	Number.
New. Ind. Ant.	New Indian Antiquary, Bombay.
Numis.	Numismatic.
PHAI.	Political History of Ancient India, by H. C. Raychaudhari, 6th Ed., Calcutta.
Proc. (*Proceed.*)	Proceedings.
P. O.	Poona Orientalist.
Priyā.	Priyadarśikā of Harṣa.
PTS.	Pali Text Society, London.
Pur.	Purāṇa.
Ratnā.	Ratnāvalī of Harṣa.
Rep.	Report.
Trans.	Translation.
SBE.	Sacred Books of the East, Oxford.
RKMGE.	Gupta Empire by Dr. Radha Kumud Mookerjee, Sec. Ed., Bombay, 1952.
RV.	Ṛigveda.
THK.	History of Kanuaj by R. S. Tripathi, Bombay, 1937.
VA.	Vedic Age (Vol. I of the History and Culture of Indian People), Bhartiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay.
VS.	Vikrama Saṁvat.
YS.	Yājñavalkya Smṛiti.

CONTENTS

CHAPTER I

POLITICAL BACKGROUND

Rise of new powers

CHAPTER II

FAMILY AND HERITAGE OF HARṢA

CHAPTER III

BIRTH AND EARLY LIFE OF HARṢA

CHAPTER IV

HARṢA'S ACCESSION TO POWER

CHAPTER V

WARS AND CONQUESTS

CHAPTER VI

EXTENT OF HARṢA'S EMPIRE

Extent of Harṣa's Empire

CHAPTER VII

ADMINISTRATION

CHAPTER VIII

HARSA AS AN AUTHOR AND PATRON OF AUTHORS

SECTION A

SECTION B

SECTION C

CHAPTER IX

THE SOCIETY

CHAPTER X

SOCIETY (CONTINUED)

CHAPTER XI

RELIGION AND PHILOSOPHY

SECTION A

SECTION B

CHAPTER XII

LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

CHAPTER XIII

EDUCATION AND LEARNING

CHAPTER XIV

ART

CHAPTER XV

ECONOMIC LIFE

CHAPTER I

POLITICAL BACKGROUND

DISMEMBERMENT OF THE GUPTA EMPIRE

DEATH OF KUMĀRAGUPTA I : END OF AN ERA

Kumāragupta I (c.A.D. 415-455) enjoyed a long era of peace and prosperity and the mighty empire of the Imperial Guptas is said to have "reached its zenith" during his reign for nearly four decades. But the closing years of his career were not happy and peaceful. During the evening of his life the old emperor was challenged by the enemies.[1] At

---

1. *The problem of identification of these enemies has been highly controversial. According to Dr. Fleet, they were Puṣyamitras. In support of his view Dr. Fleet refers to Prof. Weber's Sanskrit Literature, P. 223, note 237; and also to Ind. Ant., Vol. II, pp. 362f. He further says that "the correct form of the first part of the name is 'Pushya', not 'Pushpa', CII., Vol. III, No. 13, P. 55, Footnote 2; Shri Jagannath agrees with Fleet and says that they lived in Central India. IHQ., Vol. XII, pp. 122f. But Shri H. R. Divekar reads them as "Yudhyamitra" and concludes that they were Hūṇas. ABORI., Vol. 1, Part 2, P. 99. Dr. R. D. Banerjee opines that "a close examination of the original shows that the suggested reading is impossibile on account of impossibility of the second syllable being 'Yu'." AIG., P. 45. Similar view is held by Dr. B. P. Sinha. DKM., pp. 1f. Dr. Sircar does not come to any definite conclusion and says that "it is not possible to be definite." Select Inscriptions., P. 314, Footnote 2. An attempt has been made to suggest that the Puṣyamitras were the successors of Puṣhyavarman of Kāmarūpa. IHQ., Vol. XXI, pp. 24f. Smith says, "(they) were a rich and powerful nation" and "otherwise almost unknown to history." EHI., P. 326. Fleet says that they belonged to the Narmadā valley and lived in Amarakaṇṭaka region. CII., Vol. III, No. 13, P. 55; Ind. Ant., Vol. XVIII; P. 228. According to Hoernle they lived somewhere in north and 'probably' were identical to Maitrakas of Valabhī.*

this critical juncture his young son Skandagupta came forward to meet the challenge and defeated the enemies. It was, however, unfortunate that the old father could not live to welcome his victorious son.[2]

SKANDAGUPTA AND HIS BRILLIANT ACHIEVEMENTS

Skandagupta came to the Gupta throne about A.D. 455. His whole life, in fact, was an epic of struggle. He fought and subdued the Hūṇas and the Mlechchhas and all other hostile kings. These achievements were his crowning successes. To be brief one can say that it was Skandagupta who saved the empire. But for him the empire would have met its complete annihilation. Skandagupta not only saved the empire for his dynasty, but he also saved the country from barbarians. For these crowning achievements Skandagupta deserves highest tributes due to any national hero.

JRAS., 1909, *P.* 126. *References to Puṣyamitras are also found in the Purāṇas along with the other dynasties. Pargiter, Dynasties of the Kali Age, P.* 73; *Cat. of Coins in the Ind. Mus. Vol. I, P.* 97. *For Puṣyamitras reference may be made to Viṣṇupurāṇa, IV.,* 24. 17.; *Sacred Books of the East, Vol. XXII, pp.* 292*f.*; *JRAS.*, 1911, *P.* 138. *Dr. Raychaudhary says that "the position of the Pusyamitras was between the Māhiṣyas (the people of Māhiṣmatī ?) and the Nerbudda-Son valleys." PHAI., 6th Ed., P.* 569, *Footnote; Also refer to JRAS.*, 1889, *P.* 228; *Ep. Ind., XXVII, PP.* 138*f.*

2. *The view that "Kumāragupta I was killed in the battle during his strenuous conflict with Puṣyamitras" (Basaka, History of North-Eastern India, Cal.,* 1934, *P.* 61) *appears as unwarranted in the absence of any positive suppport to it and the interpretation of the words "Pitari sura-sakhitvaṁ prāptavaty ātmaśaktyā" (CII., Vol. III, No.* 14, *P.* 59. *Line* 4) *is baseless. Fleet has observed that the phrase means, "his father by his own power had attained the position of being a friend of gods" (i.e. had died). CII., Vol. III, No.* 14, *P.* 62, *Footnote* 3. *It gives no hint at all that he died in the battle. But that he faced bad and critical days in his old age, is a fact. On the grounds of numismatic evidences Dr. Altekar has also reached this conclusion. JNSI., Vol. V, pp.* 135-36; *Ibid., Vol. VIII, Part* 2, *pp.* 179 *f.*

DEATH OF SKANDAGUPTA

The death of Skandagupta about A.D. 467-8 was the clear signal for the forces of disruption and disintegration. The imperial ship lost its skilled captain who had sailed courageously in the troubled waters. The old glory began to fade soon after his death.

PURUGUPTA

The problem of succession after the death of Kumāragupta I has raised many controversies. Some scholars[3] accept Skandagupta as an immediate successor of his fath-r whereas others[4] consider it better to accept Purugupta as an immediate successor to Kumāragupta I. Some scholars also suggests that Skandagupta and Purugupta were one and the same person[5] whereas others try to suggest that after Kumāragupta I the empire was partitioned between Purugupta and Skandagupta.[6] A

---

3. *Smith, EHI., 4th Ed., P.* 326; *Raychaudhary, PHAI., 6th Ed., pp.* 572-78; *R. C. Majumdar, CA., pp.* 25-26; *R. S. Tripathi, History of Ancient India,* 1942, *P.* 261; *IHQ., XXII, P.* 319; *Ārya-Mañjuśrī-Mūlakalpa, Ed. T. Ganapati Sastri, Vol. I, P.* 628.

4. *Dr. B. P. Sinha has made a very detailed and deep study of this problem in his 'magnum opus' and has come to the conclusion that Purugupta was the immediate successor to Kumāragupta I. DKM. pp.* 4-49. *This painstaking task is really praiseworthy but it cannot be accepted conclusively. The learned scholar, too, opines that Purugupta must have ruled for less than a year and his rule was inglorious. Ibid., P.* 44.

5. *Probably Dr. Hoernle was the first scholar to initiate this theory. JRAS.,* 1909, *Part I, P.* 129.; *Ref. may also be made to Ep. Ind., XXVI, Part V, pp.* 235*f.*; *Ind. Ant., XLVII,* 1918, *pp.* 161*f.*

6. *If this conclusion is accepted, for a time being, we have to keep it in mind that this was not a partition on equal terms. Skandagupta might have succeeded Kumāragupta I as an emperor of Magadhan Empire and alloted a portion of it to Purugupta. Thus, according to Basak, too, "Purugupta was the first king of new line of rulers (a branch of the Imperial Gupta dynasty), who were allowed by Skandagupta and his successors to enjoy a small kingdom, somewhere in the eastern portion*

careful analysis of the original sources leads us to believe that Skandagupta succeeded his father Kumāragupta I. Skandagupta's successor was Mahārājādhirāja Purugupta, son of Kumāragupta I by his chief queen Anantadevī. He must have been an old man when he ascended the throne. His rule did not last long and he died sometime before 473 A.D.[7] Numismatic and epigraphic evidences throw much light on the Gupta history after the death of Purugupta but nothing definite and 'historic' can be said about the order of succession.

SUCESSORS OF PURUGUPTA

Purugupta had three sons by his wife queen Chandradevī,[8] named Kumāragupta II, Budhagupta and Narsiṁhagupta. The problem of their chronology and order of succession is a knotty one. On the basis of the Sārnāth Budha Stone Image Inscription, dated G.E. 154 (c.A.D. 473)[9] it can be concluded that Kumāragupta II (c.A.D. 473-476) was the immediate successor to Purugupta.[10] The Guptas under him enjoyed an imperial status and their paramount sovereignty was recognized as for as Mālavā.[11]

---

of the Gupta Empire, perhaps in Southern Bihar." (*Basak, HNEI., P.* 63.) *Dr. R. D. Banerjee says that Purugupta established his independent rule over Magadha during Skandagupta's absence at the time of the Hūṇa invasion. ABORI., Vol. I, Part I,* 1919, *cited in EHI., 4th Ed., P.* 329, *footnote* 2.

7. *PHAI., 6th Ed., pp.* 586*f.*; *B. C. Law Vol., Part I, P.* 618.

8. *ASIAR.,* 1934-35, *P.* 63.

9. *ASIAR.,* 1914-15, *Part II, pp.* 124-25; *ABORI.,* 1918-19, *pp.* 67*f., JBORS., Vol. IV., pp.* 344 *and* 412.

10. *IHQ., Vol. XIX, pp.* 119-125; *RKMGE., P.* 107. *Late Dr. R. D. Banerjee has put much reliance on the Nālandā Seals of Viṣṇugupta and Budhagupta. According to him Purugupta's immediate successor was Narsiṁhagupta. Kumāragupta II. was son of Narsiṁhagupta and grandson of Purugupta. AIG., pp.* 53-54. *Dr. Raychaudhary, too, says that "Purugupta seems to have been succeeded by his son Narsiṁhagupta Bālāditya." PHAI., 6th Ed., P.* 588; *B.C. Law Vol., Part I., pp.* 619-620.

11. *PHAI., 6th Ed., P.* 581; *RKMGE., P.* 107.

BUDHAGUPTA

Kumāragupta II was succeeded by his brother Budhagupta (c. A.D. 476-495). Several inscriptions of his reign prove his indisputable authority over an area from Mālvā to North Bengal and the Gupta Empire under Budhagupta "recovered its position and prestige after the dark days following the death of Skandagupta."[12]

THE DISRUPTIVE FORCES

But the forces of disruption and disintegration were also at work simultaneously. In Kāthiāwār, Governor Droṇasiṁha, unlike his two predecessors, Bhaṭārka and Dharasena I, who were simply known as Senāpatis, assumed the title of Mahārāja[13] after ceremonial installation, obviously with a wish to be recognised as an independent ruler. Thus the Maitrakas of Valabhī had embarked upon a way to set up an independent kingdom. Another branch of the Maitrakas of Mo-la-po (Mālavā) also made successful incursions as far as Sahya and Vindhya mountains.[14] Similarly in Bundelakhaṇḍa, like Maitrakas of Valabhī who were on their way to independence, king Jayanātha of Uchchhakalpa dynasty threw off his allegiance to Imperial Guptas and was almost completely independent.[15]

---

12. *RKMGE.*, *pp.* 117-118; *PHAI.*, 6*th Ed.*, *P.* 593.

13. *JBBRAS.*, *Vol. XX*, *pp.* 1*f.*; *Ep. Ind.*, *Vol.*, *XVI*, *pp.* 17*f.*; *PHAI.*, 6*th Ed.*, *P.* 629; *Dr. K. Virji*, *Ancient History of Saurāṣṭra : Maitrakas of Valabhī*, *Bom.*, 1952, *P.* 28; *CA.*, *P.* 30. *But all the Maitraka plates refer to him* (*Droṇasiṁha*) *as "one whose coronation ceremony was performed in the presence of the paramount sovereign himself"* (अखिल-भुवन-मण्डलैक स्वामिना स्वयं-उपहित-राज्याभिषेक:). *On this basis Dr. Virji has opined that, though, "the Maitrakas had thrown off the Gupta yoke, they had to acknowledge the paramountcy of some higher power"... and that "it could not have been any other than the Vākāṭakas. op. cit.*, *P.* 28. *But this is just a hypothesis and has hardly anything to support it conclusively.*

14. *EHI.*, 4*th Ed.*, *pp.* 343*f*; *PHAI.*, 6*th Ed.*, *P.* 629, *footnote* 4.

15. *This appears tenable on the basis of his two land grants, Kāritalāi Copper Plate Inscription of Mahārāja Jayanātha and Khoh Copper Plate of Mahā-*

King Udayana of Pāṇḍuvaṁśa[16] and Nāgabala and his son Bharatabala[17] of another Pāṇḍu dynasty also made similar attempts. All these rulers "achieved complete or partial independence in the later half of the fifth century A.D."[18] Another Mahārāja Lakṣamaṇa of Jayapura,[19] who ruled about 477—8 A.D. over the region between Rewā and Allāhabād[20] and Mahārāja Subandhu,[21] who is supposed to have ruled over the

---

rāja Jayanātha of G. E. 174 (*c.A.D.* 493) *and G.E.* 177 (*c.A.D.* 496) *respectively. CII., Vol. III, No.* 26, *PP.* 177-120 *and No.* 27, *pp.* 121-125.

16. *This king Udayana is known from Kālañjar Rock Ins. Ep. Ind., Vol., IV, pp.* 257*f.*

17. *They are the last two of the four rulers known from a copper plate grant discovered at Rewā. Ep. Ind., Vol. XXVII, pp.* 132*f.; Bhārata Kaumadī, I, pp.* 215*f; Prof. Mirashi's article on "Three Ancient Dynasties of Mahākośala' in the Bulletin of the Deccan College Research Institute, (K.N. Dikshit Memorial Volume), pp.* 47*f. Prof. Mirashi has dealt at length on the historicity of Pāṇḍava dynasty of Mekala. The Indian Historical Research Institute Silver Jubilee Commemoration Vol., pp.* 288*f. This article is also incorporated in his 'Studies in Indology'. Vol. I, pp.* 213-219.

18. *CA., P.* 31.

19. *The place has not yet been properly identified.*

20. *He is known from the copper plate grant discovered at Singrauli in erstwhile Rewā State bordering Mirzapur district. Ep. Ind., Vol. II, pp.* 364*f; ASIAR.,* 1936-37, *pp.* 88*f.*

21. *He is known from his land grant of G.E.* (?) 167 (*c.A.D.* 486 (?)) *discovered at Barawānī (M.P.). Annual. Report. of the Rajputana Museum,* 1924-25, *Ep. Ind., Vol. XIX, pp.* 261*f; CII. Vol. IV., pp.* 17*f. This is dated in the year* 167. *No era has been specified on it. Mr. Haldar thinks that the date refers to Gupta Era, and says that he was a feudatory of Budhagupta. Ep. Ind., Vol. XIX., pp.* 261*f. Mirashi, on the other hand, opines that it is dated in the Kalachuri-Chedi Era, founded by the Abhrira king Iśvarasena in A.D.* 249 *and thus corresponds to* 416-17 *A.D.. IHQ, Vol. XXI, pp.* 79*f; Studies in Indology by Prof. V. V. Mirashi, Vol. II, pp.* 263-271. *Another copper plate grant of Subandhu is also discovered in that region. Ann. Rep. of the Arch. Department*

territories about Māhiṣmatī about 486. A.D., do not make any reference at all to their sovereign power and are supposed to have enjoyed independent status with 'dejure' allegiance to the Imperial Guptas.

Another notable change in the political status quo was in the case of Provincial Governors who appear to have enhanced their power. This is clear from their new titles as Mahārājas. The Governor of North Bengal, who enjoyed the title of Uparika, assumed the title of Mahārāja during the reign of Budhagupta.[22] The Governor who ruled over regions between Yamunā and Narmadā and another who ruled over areas about Eraṇ also assumed the titles of Mahārājas.[23]

The Vākāṭakas, who were an important source of strength in establishing the hegemony of the Guptas, were no more their great allies. The Vākāṭaka king Narendra Sena extended his overlordship over Kośala, Mekala and Mālvā.[24]

Thus the existence of these new independent and semi-independent rulers all over the empire and tremendous enhancement of powers and status of Provincial Governors indicate that the imperial house was finding it difficult to manage its affairs. And with the death of Budhagupta about 495 A.D.,[25] the Guptas lost their last saviour who made sincere attempts to cement the cracks in the imperial edifice. Soon after his death we come

---

of Gwalior State, 1928-29*; CII., Vol. IV, pp.* 19*ff. The views of Dr. Mirashi that the grants are dated in Kalachurī-Chedi Era appear untenable on the simple ground that by this time Guptas certainly held their sway over Central India. One can agree with Prof. Mirashi that "Gupta suzerainty seems to have suffered in Central India in the second half of the* 5*th century A.D.; but Subandhu, according to Prof. Mirashi himself flourished about* 416-17 *A.D.. At this time Gupta Empire was at its zenith and we can easily rule out the possibility of any such independent unit in Central India. Thus the year* 167 *certainly refers to Gupta Era and Subandhu must have flourished about c.A.D.* 486.

22. *CA., P.* 31.
23. *Ibid., P.* 31.
24. *PHAI., 6th Ed., P.* 634*; CA., P.* 32.
25. *PHAI., 6th Ed., p.* 593.

to a troublous period of internal quarrels for succession and renewed incursions of the Hūṇas.

NARSIMHAGUPTA BĀLĀDITYA

According to the Bhitarī and Nālandā seal inscriptions of Kumāragupta III, Budhagupta's successor was his brother Narsiṁhagupta Bālāditya.[26] Literary[27] and numismatic[28] evidences indicate his happy beginning but this state of affairs could not last long and the empire very soon plunged into difficulties. These difficulties were manifold but the renewed and reinvigorated Hūṇa invasion, scramble for independent power and status on the part of provincial governors and feudatories and family quarrels were fatal to his government. These disruptive tendencies accentuated the crisis and accelerated the process of disintegration of the empire that was already on the decline after the death of Skandagupta. A brief reference to these disruptive forces is necessary to understand the task before Narsiṁhagupta Bālāditya.

INVASION OF THE HŪṆAS

As told earlier the Hūṇas were the Central Asian nomads, who,

---

26. *RKMGE.*, *P.* 119; *CA.*, *P.* 33. *Chinese pilgrim Yuan Chwang and an inscription of the* 8*th century A.D. discovered at Nālandā record Bālāditya's great achievements. On the basis of his own coins Narsiṁhagupta and Bālāditya were one and the same person whereas others have raised certain objections to the identification. Dr. Rāychaudhary identifies him with Bhānugupta. He says that Bālāditya was a 'viruda' of Bhānugupta. PHAI.*, 6*th Ed.*, *P.* 596. *Speaking about it Dr. R. C. Majumdar* (*CA.*, *P.* 43) *has taken a better course. He says, "The most plausible view appears to be that he* (*Bālāditya*) *is identical with Narsiṁhagupta, though, it cannot be regarded as absolutely certain." For the present I have followed the line adopted by Drs. R. C. Majumdar and R. K. Mukherjee. The latter admits this identification as "most plausible." RKMGE.*, *P.* 119.

27. *Āryamañjuśrīmūlakalpa informs us that the empire under him was free from rivals and enemies* (*akanṭakaṁ*).

28. *Innumerable and heavy coins prove his prosperity and stability.*

in their struggle for supremacy and power, left their original homeland in two branches. One of these branches went to European countries and the other confined its activities to Asia. The latter became very much powerful in the fifth century A.D.. First of all, they invaded Persia and achieved tremendous success.[30] They soon crossed over the Hindukush and started their bloody massacre in Punjāb.[31] At that time it was Skandagupta who rose to the demand of the hour and successfully drove out the Hūṇas. But, unlike Indians, Persians lost their independence and the Hūṇas became the masters of a great empire with capital at Balkh.[32]

TORAMĀṆA

The man who got initial success in India was Toramāṇa,[33] the first Hūṇa chief, who invaded India right from Punjāb to Bundelakhaṇḍ[34] and his kingdom covered the areas of Uttar Pradesh, Madhya Pradesh, Rājputānā, Punjāb and Kashmīr.[35] But it was of a temporary nature and Toramāṇa had to stage a retreat.

---

29. *The subject has recently been discussed at length by Prof. Radha Krishna Choudhary. JBRS:, Vol. XLV., Parts I-IV,* 1959 (*Altekar Memorial Vol.*), 112-142.

30. *Bhandarkar Commemoration Volume, P.* 65; *JBRS., Vol. XLV., Parts I-IV,* 1959 (*Altekar Memorial Vol.*), *pp.* 114-116.

31. *Ind. Ant., Vol. XV, pp.* 245*f*; *C.A., P.* 35; *JBRS., Vol. XLV, Parts I-IV,* 1959 (*Altekar Memorial Vol.*), *pp.* 116-120.

32. *CA., P.* 35; *JBRS., Vol. XLV, Parts, I-IV,* 1959 (*Altekar Memorial Vol.*), *pp.* 116*f.*

33. *Some doubts have been expressed with regard to the nationality of Tormāṇa. New Ind. Ant., Vol. IV, pp.* 36*f*; *IHQ., Vol. XII, pp.* 532*f.*; *Dr. Majumdar opines that he* (*Tormāṇa*) *was a Hūṇa. CA., P.* 35; *JBRS., Vol. XIV, Part I-IV,* 1959 (*Altekar Memorial Vol.*), *pp.* 120*f.*

34. *This is clear from the conquest of Eraṇ. CII., Vol. III., No.* 36, 158-161; *CA., P.* 35; *JBRS., XLV., Parts, I-IV,* 1959, *pp.* 122*f.*

35. *Ibid., pp.* 122*f.*; *CA., P.* 35.

2

MIHIRAKULA

Toramāṇa's son and successor,[36] Mihirakula, was equally powerful. He is said to have ruled over India with capital at Sākala.[37] His claims of conquering southern India including Ceylon[38] are completely unwarranted and entirely baseless; but the lengthy tales of his cruelty, brutality and inhuman conduct, as described in the Rājataraṅgiṇī, seem to fit in with his career.[39] These tales also find their echo in the narrative of Yuan Chwang.[40] On the basis of the available sources it appears difficult to construct the proper and chronologically accepted sequence of events of the period under review. We can briefly conclude that Tormāṇa's success in his expeditions was not of permanent nature and that he had to satisfy his territorial ambitions with limited Indian territory. His son, however, was more successful in implemening his father's policy and designs. He founded a great kingdom which extended as far as Gwalior.[41]

His sphere of influence was still wider and Yuan Chwang accredits him as a subduer of whole of India.[42] But like his predecessor, he, too, failed to make a lasting gain. Yaśodharman and Narsiṁhagupta shattered his pride and struck a severe blow to his dreams. Yaśodharman claims that Mihirakula accepted defeat at his hands and paid him respectful tributes

---

36. *This view is held on the basis of Ārya-Mañjuśrī-Mūlakalpa. (Imperial History of India, pp.* 64-65). *But according to Rājataraṅgiṇī Tormāṇa "flourished long after Mihirakula, about eighteen kings intervening between these two rulers." Mihirakula's father, according to Rājataraṅgiṇī, was son of Vasukula and grandson of Hiraṇyakula. Rājataraṅginī, I,* 288-89*f.; Vol. I, pp.* 43*f.; JBRS., Vol. XLV, Parts I-IV,* 1959 *(Altekar Memorial Vol.), pp.* 125*f.*

37. *Ibid., pp.* 125-133*; Buddhist Records of the Western World by Samuel Beal, London,* 1906*, I, pp.* 166-167.

38. *Rājataraṅgiṇī, I,* 289*; III,* 192*; JBRS., Vol. XLV, Parts I-IV,* 1959 *(Altekar Memorial Vol.), pp.* 125*f.*

39. *Rājataraṅginī, I,* 289*f.*

40. *Beal, op cit., Vol. I, pp.* 168*f.*

41. *CII., Vol. III, No.* 37*, pp.* 161-164*; CA., P.* 37*; JBRS., Vol. XLV, Parts I-IV,* 1959 *(Altekar Memorial Vol.), P.* 126.

42. *Beal, op. cit., Vol. I, P.* 168.

at his feet.[43] It appears that Mihirakula came into conflict with Yaśodharman during his march to Central India.[44] Probably the Hūṇa king defeated and killed Vajra, the son of Bālāditya[45] and brought to an end the viceregal family of the Dattas of Puṇḍravardhana.[46] But he met his Waterloo at Mandsaur at the hands of Yaśodharman. Unfortunately, Yaśodharman, too, had a short career[47] and after his death Mihirakula again raised his ugly head. At this time Narsiṁhagupta Bālāditya, though terrorised in intial stages, was successful in defeating Mihirkula and saved the Gupta Empire from the onslaughts of barbarous Hūṇas.[48] It is probable that

---

४३. स्थाणोरन्यत्र येन प्रणति-कृपणतां प्रापितं नोत्तमाङ्ग
यस्याश्लिष्टो भुजाभ्यां वहति हिमगिरिर्दुर्गं शब्दाभिमान (म्)।
नीचैस्तेनापि यस्य प्रणन्ति भुजबलावर्ज्जन क्लिष्ट मूर्द्धा
(चू) ड़ा पुष्पोपहारैर्म्मिहिरकुल-नृपेणार्च्चित (–) पाद-युग्मम् ॥६॥

Mandasaur Praśasti. CII., Vol. III, No. 33, *pp.* 142-148.

44. *Smith's view (EHI., pp.* 337-8) *that "the native princes under the leadership of Yaśodharman, a Rājā of Central India, appear to have formed a confederacy against the foreign tyrant", is just a hypothesis. Epigraphic evidences (CII., Vol. III, No.* 33, *pp.* 142-48) *give the credit of defeating the Hūṇas singularly to Yaśodharman. It is, however, probable that some chiefs of the neighbouring kingdoms might have offered their support to Yaśodharmana who emerged as a defender of the motherland against the barbarian and tyrant Hūṇa chief and the defeat of Mihirakula was final. PHAI.,* 6*th Ed., pp.* 596*f.; JBRS., Vol. XLV.,* 1959, *pp.* 129*f.*

45. *PHAI.,* 6*th Ed., P.* 597, *footnote* 2.

46. *Ibid., P.* 597.

47. *Ibid., pp.* 597-98.

48. *CA., P.* 38. *This is the view of Father Heras who opines that the defeat of Mihirakula at the hands of Bālāditya took place after the Hūṇa king's conflict with Yaśodharman. JBORS.,* 1927, *cited in PHAI.,* 6*th Ed., P.* 596, *footnote* 3. *Similar views are expressed by other scholars. JBRS., Vol. XLV, Parts I-IV,* 1959 *(Altekar Memorial Vol.), pp.* 130-131. *But Dr. Raychaudhary opines that the victory of Bālāditya over Mihirakula was not decisive. The latter was "finally subjugated by Janendra Yaśodharman some time before* 533 *A.D." PHAI.,* 6*th Ed., pp.* 596-7, *footnote* 3. *Recently Prof. Radhakrishna Chaudhary*

he was assisted by the Maukharī king Īśānavarman in his struggle against the Hūṇas and it is also likely that Īśānavarman or his son Sarvavarman again singularly defeated the Hūṇas.[49] With the defeat of Mihirkula, the Huṇas' political gains were completely undone and their power completely collapsed in this country.[50] Hūṇas could never succeed in establishing their independent kingdom enduring for a long time. But their barbarous onslaughts certainly "contributed further to the disintegration of the Gupta Empire."[51]

UNCOMPROMISING FEUDATORIES

After the Hūṇas, another shock came from the rebellious feudal chiefs and high executives who made several, gradual and successful attempts to wrest power and who carved out their independent principalities. Several inscriptions belonging to this period give an impression of complete political instability, confusion and bewilderment. The Vākāṭakas, who were loyal and trusted allies since the marriage of Prabhāvatī Gupta, threw off their allegiance and extended their authority over Mālvā and Gujrat under Hariṣeṇa. Thus the politically important, strategic and fertile province of Mālvā was out of the Gupta empire. Like that of the Hūṇas and Vākāṭakas, another shock came from Yaśodharman of Mandsaur. With the weakening Gupta authority, he also founded an independent kingdom of his own and defied the overlordship of the Guptas.

YAŚODHARMAN AND HIS ACHIEVEMENTS

It is, indeed, a pity that we know very little about Yaśodharman, who, after Skandagupta, emerged as a great defender of the motherland. Our knowledge of this great Indian of indomitable character is confined to three inscriptions.[52] But none of them throw any light on his ancestry.

---

has also concluded that, "it was not Yaśodharman, but Bālāditya who dealt a final blow to the Hūṇas. JBRS., Vol. XLV, Parts I-IV, 1959, *P.* 131.

49. *CA., pp.* 38-9; *JBRS., Vol. XLV., Parts I-IV,* 1959, *P.* 131.

50. *Ibid., pp.* 136*f.*

51. *CA., pp.* 38-39; *JBRS., Vol. XLV, Parts I-IV,* 1959 (*Altekar Memorial Vol.*), *pp.* 136*f.*

52. *CII., Vol. III, Nos.* 33, 34 *and* 35.

The Mandsaur Stone Inscription of Yaśodharman Viṣṇu-vardhan[53] of the year 589 V.S. (?)[54] simply states that he made the Aulikara[55] family famous by his achievements; but no reference is made to any of his predecessors.[56]

---

53. *CII., Vol. III, No.* 35, *pp.* 150-158; *Ind. Ant., Vol. XV, pp.* 222*f.*

54. *The inscription refers to the Mālvā era, now popularly known as Vikrama Saṁvata.*

55. प्रख्यात औलिकर लांछन आत्मवंशो येनोदितोदित पदं गमितो गरीयः *CII., Vol. III, pp.* 153-56. *Fleet says, quite unhesitatingly, that he "had not been able to obtain any explanation of the word 'Aulikara'." He says : "It seems to denote either the 'hot-rayed-sun' or the 'cool-rayed-moon'." CII., Vol. III, P.* 151, *Note* 4. *The first assumption may indicate that the sun-rayed crest might have been the royal insignia of the Aulikaras.*

56. *Dr. Jayaswal, on the basis of Yaśodharman's devotion to "Sthāṇu"* (*CII., Vol. III, P.* 148, *Line* 6) *opines that Yaśodharman-Viṣṇu-vardhan evidently belonged to Thāneśvara* (*better known as Sthāneśvara* (*Sthāṇu-Īśvra*) *and thus belonged to the dynasty of Vardhanas. Imperial Hist. of India., pp.* 41*f. This is untenable. No link can be maintained between Yaśodharman-Viṣṇuvardhan and the famous Vardhanas* (*Puṣpabhūtis*) *of Thāneśvara. Kielhorn has rightly observed that the reference in inscription pertaining to his devotion to 'Śiva' is really to Mihirakula. Ind. Ant., Vol. XVII, pp.* 219-220; *Bāṇa also does not refer to any such connection between Yaśodharman and Puṣpabhūtis.*

But recently new light has been thrown on the ancestry of Yaśodharman. Epigrapnic evidences have come to light that Narvarman, the father of Viśvavarman and grandfather of Bandhuvarman, belonged to the 'Aulikara' lineage. Ep. Ind., Vol. XXVI, Pt. 3, *p.* 130. *This shows that the Aulikaras were not altogether insignificant historically and politically. It has been observed that Yaśodharman "can no longer be regarded as a military adventurer of the type of Śaśāṅka of Gauḍa and Yaśovarman of Kanauj." Ibid. Further light on Yaśodharman's lineage is thrown by two inscriptions of king Gaurī, one found near Neemuch* (*M.P.*) *and the other at Mandsaur. Ep. Ind., Vol. XXX, Part IV. On the basis of these and several other inscriptions and an information given by Varāhamihira,* (*Bṛhatsaṁhitā, Adhyāya LXXXVI, Verses* 1-4), *Prof. Mirashi has worked out a genealogy of the*

But the Bihar Kotra inscription of Naravarman's time[57] and two inscriptions of king Gaurī[58] and several other inscriptions have thrown much light on the early history of the Aulikaras.[59] These epigraphic evidences and a passage in Bṛhatsaṁhitā of Varāhamihira[60] have enabled Prof. Mirashi to construct a workable genealogy of the Aulikaras who ruled at Ujjayinī. Dr. Chakravarty[61] and Prof. Mirashi[62] have maintained that Yaśodharman cannot be regarded as a military adventurer or 'an upstart., Before he came to prominence, the Aulikarars had gained enough political importance[63] in Central India.

His achievements are specifically enumerated in his Mandsor stone pillar inscription.[64] He is said to have extended the 'boundaries

---

Aulikaras. He says that the Aulikaras got great importance before Yaśodharman. The latter's immediate predecessor was Dravyavardhan who "may have been his father." Studies in Indology, Vol. I, P. 211. *He further says that "Yaśodharman was not 'an upstart'. His predecessors Ādityavardhan and Dravyavardhan were known as Mahārājādhirājas." Ibid. The learned scholar has also maintained that they ruled over their kingdom with capital at Ujjayinī, not Daśpura. Explaining the location of victory pillars at Daśpura he says that they "commemorate the memorable victory which Yaśodharman obtained over the Hūṇa king Mihirakula. The battle appears to have been fought at Daśapura." Studies in Indology, I, P.* 212; *IHQ., Vol. XXXIII, pp.* 314*f.*

57. *Ep. Ind., Vol. XXVI, Pt.* 3, *P.* 130.

58. *Ibid., Vol. XXX, Pt.* 4.

59. *IHQ., Vol. XXXIII, pp.* 314*f.; Studies in Indology, Vol. I., pp.* 206-212.

60. *Adhyaāy LXXXVI, Verses* 1-4.

61. *Ep. Ind., Vol. XXVI, pt.* 3, *P.* 130.

62. *IHQ., Vol. XXXIII, P.* 314; *Studies in Indology, Vol. I, pp.* 206*f.*

63. *This is evident from the fact that his two immediate predecessors Āditya-vardhan and Dravyavardhan assumed the titles of Mahārājādhirāja.*

64. *CII., Vol. III, No.* 33, *pp.* 142-148, *Lines* 5 *to* 7.

of his kingdom' and subdued whole of northern India, right from the river Lauhitya (Nefā) to Western Ocean, and from the snowy Himālayas to Mahendragirī.[65] The countries, "which not even the Guptas and Hūṇas could subdue, were in his possession, and homage was paid to him by Mihirakula."[66]

From these accounts it is clear that they contain hyperbolic and conventional generalizations and certainly cannot be completely regarded as historical records of the achievements of Yaśodharman. Dr. Majumdar has observed that "we should hardly be justified in regarding Yaśodharman as the sole undisputed monarch of Northern India."[67] But these accounts of the Praśastikāras cannot be dismissed as altogether baseless. They are official records publicly proclaimed and engraved, and, therefore, we cannot ignore them. He "exercised some sort of loose hegemony over north during the heyday of his power."[68] Had there been no basis at all "such bold claims would not probably have been made in public records. It could not be engraved unless there was some basis for it."[69] He was a great general and a terrible fighter. His claims to have conquered the Hūṇa Chief Mihirakula have been generally accepted,[70] and it was, probably, after this conquest over the tyrannical and barbarous Hūṇas, Yaśodharman was rightly acclaimed as "Janendra" i.e. 'Lord of the people', and won an admiration of his people.[71] With his popularity and public support and efficient administration he might have achieved further conquests and enjoyed great fame from the Lauhitya division of Nefā to Western

---

65. *CII., Vol. III, No.* 33, *P.* 146.

66. *CII., Vol. III, No.* 34, *pp.* 149*f. The inscription only preserves reference to Mihirakula, but other informations pertaining to Guptas', Hūṇas and to Yaśodharman's territorial boundaries are lost.*

67. *CA., P.* 40.

68. *THK., P.* 23.

69. *CA., P.* 40.

70. *Ibid., P.* 40; *THK., P.* 23; *RKMGE., P.* 121.

71. *THK., P.* 29.

Ocean and from the Himālayas to Mahendragirī.[72] But his actual territorial gains cannot definitely be demarcated. What we can conclude definitely is that he might have enjoyed a short-lived rule over Mālvā and some adjoining territories, probably, at the cost of the Gupta empire[73]. This success of Yaśodharman was purely on temporary basis[74] and we soon find the re-establishment of the Gupta overlordship[75] in this region. But the far-reaching consequences of this "short-lived" rule of Yaśodharman were certainly disastrous to Gupta power as we notice that soon after it and, most probably, "as an inevitable consequence thereof", many feudatories became more powerful and uncontrollable.[76] Many fresh attempts were made by feudatories for carving out new principalities and the existing ones were no longer in a mood to respect the suzerainty of their declining master. His (Yaśodharman's) "dazzling military success for the time being led others to imimate his example. It, thus, led to a general uprising among the feudatories of the Guptas and Yaśodharman himself was probably the first victim to perish in the conflagration that his own action had brought about."[77]

---

72. *According to Smith, it "should be understood to mean the southernmost peak (Mahendragirī) of the Travancore Ghāts. EHI., Fourth Ed., P.* 339.*; Fleet, unhesitatingly, confesses that "it is doubtful whether this denotes here the famous Mahendragirī or Mahendrāchala in the Ganjām Distt. among the Eastern Ghāts" or "another mountain of the same name" which "appears to be mentioned in Nāsik inscription of Shrī Pulumāyī. Arch. Survey, West. Ind., Vol. IV., No.* 14.*, pp.* 108-9. *It must be located somewhere in the Western Ghāts. CII., Vol. III, No.* 33, *P.* 146, *note* 1.

73. *CA., P.* 40.

74. *PHAI., Sixth Ed., P.* 597.

75. *Ibid., pp.* 597-8. *The Dāmodarpur Copper-Plate ins. of* 543-44 *A.D. (Ep. Ind., Vol. XV, pp.* 113*f.) refers to the Viceroy of the Gupta sovereign with full imperial titles such as Paramabhaṭṭāraka, Mahārājādhirāja and Pṛithvīpati.*

76. *CA., P.* 40.

77. *CA., P.* 41.

INTERNECINE FAMILY FEUDS

All these disruptive forces, unfortunately, were indirectly welcomed, rather, encouraged by the divided house of the Guptas. Empires rise and fall, and, generally speaking, the divided loyalties among the princes and aspirants for the throne lead to virtual fall. This also happened with the Guptas. Official genealogy shows that Budhagupta was succeeded by Narsiṁhagupta and the latter was succeeded by his son Kumāragupta III. The latter was succeeded by his son Viṣṇugupta; but, simultaneously, we have records of two other Gupta kings.

VAINYAGUPTA

The Gunaigarh copper plate inscription of G.E. 188 (c.A.D. 507) informs us that Vainyagupta made a land grant from his victory camp (Skandhāvāra) at Kripura to his feudatory Mahārāja Rudradatta. An analysis of this inscription bearing a royal seal with the legend "Mahārāja Shrī Vainyagupta" makes it certain that Vainyagupta enjoyed complete sovereignty over the eastern part of Bengāl.[78] Probably he belonged to the family of Imperial Guptas. It has been suggested that he was son of Purugupta;[79] but nothing definite can be maintained about his relationship with the main line.[80] His dated inscription makes him contemporary to Narsimhagupta, and he, most probably, taking an advantage of Narsiṁhagupta's multifarious difficulties, set up an independent rule in Bengāl. His rule, however, appears to be short-lived.

BHĀNUGUPTA

While Vainyagupta established an independent principality in

---

78. *IC., Vol. V., P.* 301.; *CA., P.* 33.; *B. C. Law Vol., I., P.* 625; *PHAI., Sixth Ed., P.* 596, *Footnote* 2, *also P.* 691, *footnote* 1; *IHQ.*, 1930, *pp.* 35 *and* 561; *Prabāsī*, 1338, *P.* 675. *His existence is also proved by certain seals discovered at Nālandā. ASIAR.*, 1930-34, *Part* 1, *P.* 230 *and* 249.

79. *IHQ., Vol. XXIV, pp.* 67*f.*

80. *PHAI., Sixth Ed., P.* 596, *Footnote.*

the eastern part of the Gupta domain, we find Bhānugupta[81] making similar attempts in the western part of the Empire. The Eraṇ posthumous stone pillar inscription of G.E. 191 (c.A.D. 510)[82] refers to king Bhānugupta and his great personality.[83] It records that Bhānugupta was accompanied by his feudatory chief Goparāja.[84] The latter died (svargagato) in the battle[85] and it was there that his most beloved and faithful wife committed satī[86]. In the absence of royal titles like Mahārāja and Mahārājādhirāja, Dr. Mukherjee opines that Bhānugupta was the Governor of Mālvā under Narsiṁhagupta. In that capacity it was his duty to fight against the Hūṇas and it is in that attempt he lost his valiant henchman Goparāja.[87]

This simultaneous emergence of Mahārāja Śrī Vainyagupta and Rājā Bhānugupta in the time of Bālāditya requires a more convincing explanation, and "the most plausible explanation", according to Dr. R. C. Majumdar, "seems to be that there were several rival claimants to the throne, who set themselves up in the different parts of the Empire and succeeded for the time being in holding their own."[88] Thus Vainyagupta

---

81. *Dr. Raychaudhary opines that "It is not improbable that 'Bālāditya' was a viruda of Bhānugupta", (Ibid., P. 596, Footnote 2) but this view of the learned scholar has not been generally accepted by other scholars.*

82. *CII., Vol. III, No.* 20, *pp.* 91-93.

83. श्रीभानुगुप्तो जगति प्रवीरो
राजा महान्पार्थ समो (ऽ) तिशूर:
CII., Vol. III, No. 20, *P.* 92. *Line* 5.

84. *Ibid., pp.* 92-93.

85. *Scholars generally agree to a conclusion that this battle was fought against the Hūṇas. CA., P.* 34.

86. *CII., Vol. III, No.* 20, *P.* 93. *This is "the earliest epigraphic record referring to the custom of Satī in this country. K.D. Bajpai, Sagar Through the Ages, Sagar,* 1964, *P.* 14.

87. *Ibid., pp.* 92-93*; RKMGE., P.* 120*; PHAI., Sixth Ed., P.* 596, *Footnote* 2.

88. *CA., P.* 34.

and Bhānugupta were contemporaries to Narsiṁhagupta. Both of them also enjoyed some independent political status.

NARSIṀHAGUPTA

With this brief reference to Vainyagupta and Bhānugupta we must come to the main line of Narsiṁhagupta. As we have seen earlier how Narsiṁhagupta's peaceful beginnings were soon followed by catastrophes and turmoils mainly caused by the Hūṇas. "Perforce acknowledgement of the Hūṇa overlordship, though lasting temporarily, was a great and rude shock to the old glory of the mighty empire and it added an insult to injuries caused by family dissensions. He could not rest peacefully for long and made an attempt to kick out the Hūṇas. He succeeded in his mission",[90] and this was certainly a great success to his credit. It is rightly regarded as "the last great service that the Gupta Emperor was destined to render to his motherland."[91]

KUMĀRAGUPTA III

Narsiṁhagupta's rule came to an end some time before 543 A.D.[92].

---

89. *Ibid., P.* 38; *JBRS., Vol. XLV, Parts I-IV,* 1959, *pp.* 127*f.*

90. *Bālāditya's troops are said to have imprisoned Mihirakula. The latter was set free on the petition of Bālāditya's mother. Beal, Si-yū-ki., Vol. I., P.* 171; *Watters, Vol. I, P.* 289.

91. *Yuan Ghwang's accounts are supported by epigraphic evidence. A Nālandā inscription refers to Bālāditya's valour and patronge to Buddhism. CA., P.* 43. *Footnote* 1.

92. *This can be said on the basis of the fifth Dāmodarpur Copper Plate dated G. E.* 224 (*c.A.D.* 543-4). *Ep. Ind., Vol. XV, Pp.* 114*f; Ibid., Vol. XVII, P.* 193. *As the portion referring to the name of the ruler is badly damaged, nothing can be said definitely. It has been suggested that it may read 'Kumāra' and date may be taken as* 224. *Ep. Ind., Vol. XVII, P.* 193; *Basak, HNEI., Pp.* 92-3. *This Kumāra is identified with Kumāragupta, son of Narsiṁha Gupta. JIH., Vol. IV, P.* 118.; *Ep. Ind., Vol. XVII, P.* 84. *Some scholars, on the other hand, identify him with Kumāragupta of the 'Later Guptas'. Sel. Inp., P.* 33, *Footnote* 4; *Majumdar, History of Bengal, Vol. I., P.* 49.

He was succeeded by his son Kumāragupta III. He assumed the titles of Paramadaivatā, Paramabhaṭṭāraka, Mahārājādhirāja and Prithvīpatī. These titles, though merely conventional, indcicate that Kumāragupta III gathered around him a hallow of imperial grandeur and, probably, as Dr. R. K. Mukherjee believes, there was "no diminution in the extent of Gupta Empire."[93] But this was just a shadow of an empire. His coins indicate the speedy decline of the imperial power.[94]

VIṢṆUGUPTA

Kumāragupta III was succeeded by his son Viṣṇugupta.[95] He, like his predecessor, does not appear to have enjoyed a significant status. The debased coins of these two rulers present "a striking testimony to the speedy decline of the Gupta Empire,"[96] but the existence of gold coins indicate that the hallowness of the empire had yet some basis for its existeence. Viṣṇu Gupta ruled up to 570 A.D.[97] In his life time we find Gupta Empire on its way to rapid delcine. About 552 A.D., we note that his authority was not recognised even at Magadha—the very centre of Gupta strong-hold.[98] But nominal Gupta suzerainty was accepted in North Bengāl,[99] Orissa[100] and Valabhī.[101] It seems that some loyal and devoted

---

93. *RKMGE.*, *P.* 124.

94. *CA.*, *P.* 43.

95. *Ep. Ind.*, *Vol. XXVI, pp.* 235*f.*; *IHQ.*, *Vol. XIX, pp.* 1198 *PHAI.*, *Sixth Ed.*, *P.* 591.

96. *CA.*, *P.* 43.

97. *CA.*, *P.* 43; *Dr. Sinha opines that his rule came to an end about A.D.* 551-52. *DKM.*, *Pp.* 129, 166.

98. *This is based on an information derived from a land grant dated* 551-2 *A.D., discovered in Gayā Distt. This was issued by Kumārāmātya Mahārāja Nandana without making any reference to Imperial Guptas. Ep. Ind., Vol. X, Pp.* 49*f.*

99. *This is based on the existence of an inscription dated* 543 *A.D. CA.*, *P.* 44.

100. *A similar inscription of* 569 *A.D. Ibid.*, *P.* 44.

101. *Another inscription of* 550 *A.D. Ibid.*, *P.* 44.

feudatories had still regards for their master but the latter had lost effective control over the empire and with the end of the rule of Viṣṇugupta we come to the end of the Gupta Empire.

But we do not know who was actually the last ruler who ruled over the last domains. On the basis of a land grant discovered in Gayā District, issued in 551-2 A.D. by Kumārāmātya Mahārāja Nandana, Dr. Majumdar opines that "by 550 A.D. Guptas had ceased to exercise effective authority over the greater part of Magadha" and Nandana maintained "nominal allegiance to the Guptas."[102] At that time Viṣṇugupta was on the Gupta throne. The closing years of his reign "must have been over-clouded with deadly conflicts" between the Maukharis and the Later Guptas,[103] and "amidst the rattling of sword" rule of the last of the Imperial Guptas appears to have come to an end.[104]

THE RISE OF THE NEW POWERS ON THE RUINS OF THE GUPTA EMPIRE

The forces that led to the decline and fall of the Gupta Empire are already analysed. To recapitulate, the most important of them were the internecine family feuds, the Hūṇa inroads and lust for dominions of contemporary kings, feudatories and provincial governors.

The last factor is of great importance to understand the chronology of the political events that preceded the rise of Harṣa. The mighty Gupta Empire crumbled into pieces and a number of small kingdoms rose on its ruins. Of these the following were the most important.

1. The Later Guptas.
2. The Maukharīs of Kānyakubja.
3. The Puṣpabhūtis of Śthāneśvara.
4. The Maitrakas of Valabhī.
5. The Gurjaras.
6. The kingdoms of Vaṅga and Gauḍa.

---

102. *Ibid., P.* 44.
103. *DKM., P.* 129.
104. *Ibid., P.* 129.

7. Kaliṅga.
8. Kāmarūpa.
9. Kashmir.
10. Nepāl.

1. *THE LATER GUPTAS OF MAGADHA*

Like many other small dynasties of the post-Gupta period, the Later Guptas began their political career as the feudatories to the Imperial Guptas, but not long after, they declared their independence discarding the yoke of allegiance to their masters. Our knowledge about their origin and gradual rise is insufficient and poor. The Aphṣaḍ Stone Inscription[1] of Ādityasena of c.A.D. 672, discovered at Aphṣaḍ in Navāda sub-division of the Gayā District and the Deo-Baranarak Inscription of Jīvatagupta II[2] found at Varunikā in Shāhābād District are our principal epigraphic sources.

These inscriptions give no hint of any link between the Imperial Guptas and the Later Guptas. Had there been some relationship between these two lines, it would have received a prominent expression in the family records.[3] An attempt[4] to identify Kṛiṣṇagupta with Govindagupta of

---

1. *ARSIC., Vol. XV, P.* 11*; CII., Vol. III, No.* 42, *Pp.* 200-208; *Dr. Pandey, Hist. and Lit. Ins., Pp.* 149-153.*; Dr. Upadhyaya, A study of Ancient Indian Ins., Pp.* 82-85.

2. *CII., Vol. III, No.* 46, *Pp.* 213-218*; ARSIC., Vol. XVI, pp.* 68-73*; Dr. R. B. Pandey, Hist. and Lit. Ins., Pp.* 155-55*; Upadhya, Study of Anc. Ind. Ins., Pp.* 85-86.

3. *Commenting on this Dr. Raychaudhary says : "It is surprising that the panegyrists of Kṛishṇagupta's descendants should have omitted all references to the Early Guptas if their patron could really lay claim to such an illustrious ancestry... The Guptas and the Gupta Kulaputras mentioned in Bāṇa's Kādambarī and Harṣacharita may refer to the family of Kṛishṇa, if not to some hitherto unknown descendants of the imperial line. One of the princes of the early Gupta line Ghaṭotkacha Gupta of the Tumain inscription is known to have ruled over Eastern Mālvā and it is not impossible that Kṛishṇa Gupta was, in some way, connected with him". PHAI., 6th Ed., P.* 600, *footnote 1. This view of the learned scholar cannot be accepted for various reasons. He, too, unhesitatingly, confesses that "we must, however, await future discoveries to clear up the point." Ibid., P.* 600, *footnote* 1.

4, *JBRS., Vol. XXX, Pp.* 199*ff.*

Basarh Seal, therefore, does not appear to have proper basis. Chronologically speaking, too, it lacks proper support. But the subjoining syllable 'Gupta' after the names of all the rulers except that of Ādityasena appears to be significant; but that, too, does not bear much weight so long as we do not find some positive support to establish a relationship between the Imperial Guptas and the Later Guptas.[6]

KṚIṢṆAGUPTA

The Aphṣaḍ inscription designates Kṛiṣṇagupta as one 'born in a good or noble family (sadvaṁśaḥ), who brought the family to eminence. His title Nṛipaḥ, too, does not help us much in reaching to any positive conclusion with regard to his political gains. From its find-spot, the inscription suggests that about the beginning of the third decade of the sixth century A.D., Kṛiṣṇagupta, taking advantage of the declining power of the Imperial Guptas and the political confusion and instability, might have carved out a small pincipality comprising Navāda sub-division of Gayā District[7] where they continued till the time of Mahāsenagupta. But

---

5. *ASIAR.*, 1903-4, *pp.* 102*ff.*

6. *Dr. B. P. Sinha's opinion appears quite well-founded when he says that "it was probably to strengthen their claims as the legitimate successors of the Imperial Guptas...and to catch the imagination and traditional loyalty of the masses to the house of 'Guptas' they adopted 'Gupta' as the suffix to their names"....* *and "there is nothing to disprove" their relationship with the Imperial family and "have some particular reason for not proclaiming their descent from the Imperial family". DKM., P.* 133. *Dr. Hoernle regards them to have belonged to a branch of the Imperial house that ruled over Eastern Mālvā. JRAS.*, 1903, *Pp.* 551*f.*

7. *Scholars have variant opinions regarding their ancestral home. None can differ to the view that their centre of activity from Ādityasena to Jīvatgupta II was Magadha. But where did Ādityasena's predecessors live ? It cannot be determined easily. On the basis of Aphṣaḍ inscription Fleet takes them for granted as "the family of Magadha." CII., Vol. III, P.* 202. *But this conclusion has*

because of the pressure from the Maukharīs, they shifted to Eastern Mālvā. Bāṇa, who was a great learned Paṇḍita and who hailed from Magadha itself, must have definitely been aware of the political conditions of his state. Therefore, his description deserves to be accepted as an important source of information. He tells that Mahāsenagupta was of Mālvā. Dr. Raj Bali Pandey has also suggested that it was Mahāsenagupta who shifted to Mālvā and settled there. It was there he concentrated on the expansion of his kingdom.[8]

We know nothing definite about Kṛīṣṇagupta's political achievements. Aphsaḍ inscription informs us that "his arm played the part of a lion (Mṛigendra) in bruising the foreheads of the array of the rutting ele-

---

been subjected to many controversies. C.V. Vaidya says that the family ruled at Mālvā. HMHI., Vol. I, P. 24.; Similar views are expressed by Dr. R. K. Mukherjee. Harṣa, P. 53-54.; Dr. Hoernle, too, says that they ruled over Eastern Mālvā as a branch of the Imperial House. JRAS., 1903, Pp. 551f. Raychoudhary has made a conciliatory approach. He says that they ruled over Eastern Mālvā and held their sway over Magadha in the time of Ādityasena. PHAI., 6th Ed., Pp. 600f.; footnote 1, also Pp. 610-11, footnote 4. This is mainly based on an identification of Mādhavagupta of Aphsaḍ inscription with Mādhavagupta of Harṣacharita. Bāṇa clearly says that Mādhavagupta and Kumāragupta were sons of Mālvā king. HCCTH., Pp. 119-20. But Mādhavagupta was younger brother and Kumāragupta was elder. Secondly, he was placed at the services of Harṣa and we fail to understand as to how he could get an opportunity to get away from the powerful master to establish an independent principality. For further opinions. JBORS., Vol. XIV, P. 254; Ibid., Vol. XV, Pp. 651f. It is also possible that Kṛiṣna-Gupta started his rule over Magadha and the later rulers or the immediate predecessor of Mahāsenagupta shifted to Mālvā. IC., Vol. I, Pp. 214. It appears conclusively certain that Mahāsenagupta shifted to Mālvā.

8. *Dr. R. B. Pandey, Prāchīn Bhārata, P. 263.; Pires, Maukharīs, Pp. 59ff. After discussing various theories in detail Dr. Sinha has rightly summed up that Magadha was the original seat of power of the Later Guptas from the time of Kṛiṣṇagupta to Mahāsenagupta's early days. DKM., P. 156.*

phants of his haughty enemies (*dṛiptārāti*)[9] and in being victorious by its power over countless foes.[10]

He was a learned man (*Vidyādhara*) and was of spotless character (*Kalaṁkarahitaḥ*). We cannot come to any definite conclusion on the basis of these vague and conventional generalizations. He, however, deserves the credit of being the founder of the family with some achievements. He ruled from c. 490 A.D. to c. 505 A.D.[11]

HARṢAGUPTA

Kṛiṣṇagupta's successor was his son (*suta*) Harṣagupta (c. 505 A.D. 525 A.D.). He is said to have "fought many battles, always displaying a glorious triumph as it were the written record of his terrible contest."[12] Like that of his father, his achievements, too, are vague and

---

9. *Dr. Raychaudhary opines that "the driptārāti against whom he had to fight may have been Yaśodharman. PHAI., Sixth Ed., P.* 601. *But there is nothing to substantiate this conclusion. Had it been such a brilliant success against Yaśodharman, one of the mightiest generals of his times, Kṛiṣṇagupta must have mentioned it. In absence of such specific claim the opinion of the learned scholar does not sound well-founded. It may also be kept in mind that Yaśodharman flourished much earlier.*

10. "यस्यांस्यरिपुप्रतापजयिना" *CII., Vol. III, No.* 42, *Pp.* 200-208, *Line* 1. *According to E. A. Pires the enemies as referred to herein, were the Maukharis under Harivarman. The quarrel ended in matrimonial alliance. The Maukharis, Pp.* 623. *This opinion sounds well in light of their traditional rivalries. Dr. Sinha, however, opines that the enemies were the Hūṇas. DKM., Pp.* 157-158.

11. *DKM., P.* 157. *Dr. Sinha's scheme of chronology appears to have been well-worked out and it has been adopted here. Also CII., Vol. III, No.* 42, *Pp.* 200*f.*

12. यो योग्याकाल हेलावनतहृढ़धनुभीमंबाणौघपाती
मूर्टं (त): स्वस्वामिलक्ष्मीवसति विमुखितैरीक्षितः सासुपातं।
घोराणामा हवानं लिखितमिव जयं श्लाघ्येमाविहंषानो।
CII., Vol. III, No. 42. *Pp.* 200-8, *lines* 2-3; *Pandey, Hist. Lit. Ins., P.* 149. *We cannot say definitely who fought against him. Dr. Sinha says that they were Hūṇas under Mihirakula. DKM., P.* 159.

conventional.[13] But he appears to have pursued the policy of his father and might have added some territories to his hereditary principality. Marriage of his sister Princess Harṣaguptā with Maukharī Prince Ādityavarman appears to be of political significance and it must have been of some asistance to him in his ambitious scheme.

JĪVITAGUPTA

Harṣagupta was succeeded by his son Jīvitagupta I (c. 525-545 A.D.). His military achievements are more specifically recorded in comparison to those of his predecessors. He is said to have led "a military expedition to Himalayan mountainous regions and to the sea."[14] It is difficult to say anything about these campaigns. Was he fighting on behalf of his Gupta suzerain or was busy satisfying his own territorial ambitions ? We cannot reply to this question satisfactorily. It appears, as many scholars have suggested, that he led these expeditions on behalf of his Gupta overlord.[15]

His enemies bordering the sea were, most probably, the Gauḍas[16] and if the author of Ārya-Mañju-Śrī-Mūlakalpa is believed, he appears to have been successful in his mission.[17] These expeditions,[18] and specially that against the Gauḍas must have enhanced his power and status,[19] and certainly paved the way for future ascendancy.

KUMĀRAGUPTA

Kumāragupta (c. 540-560 A.D.) succeeded his father Jīvatagupta I. It was he who successfully made political capital out of his father's

13. *CA., P.* 72.
14. *CII., Vol. III, No* 42, *Pp.* 200-208, *Lines* 3-4.
15. *CA., P.* 72; *DKM., Pp.* 159-162.
16. *Ep. Ind., Vol. XIV, Pp.* 110*f.*
17. *Imp. Hist. of Ind., Pp.*42-47; *Prachīna Bhārat By Dr. Pandey, P.*263.
18. *These expeditions might have been against the enemies who "may have included ambitious Kumārāmātyas like Nandana of the Amauna Plate". PHAI., Sixth Ed., P.* 602.
19. *DKM., Pp.* 162*f.*

military expeditions. He continued his friendly terms with the Maukharis for a few years after his accession to the throne and it appears that his contemporary Maukharī ruler Īśānavarman might have assisted Kumāragupta in his successful military expedition against the Gauḍas.[20]

THEIR STRUGGLE WITH THE MAUKHARĪS

But this alliance could not last long because both of these families entertained ambitious territorial designs. Neither the old bonds of matrimonial relationship nor their common allegiance to the rapidly declining Imperial House of the Guptas could prevent their inevitable conflict and they soon came to blows. What was the immediate cause of their conflict ? It is not known to us. Most probably, as Drs. Tripathi and Sinha have suggested, the assumption of the imperial title of Mahārājādhirāja by Īśānavarman precipitated the crisis.[21] As the Haraha inscription does not refer to this title of Īśānavarman, it was, probably, after his successful participation in an expedition against the Gauḍas and also after the death of Viṣṇugupta, he might have assumed this title. The struggle, according to Aphsaḍ inscription[22] proved a brilliant success for the Later Guptas. Kumāragupta who is said to have churned (*vimathito*) like Mandara (*Mandrībhūya*) that formidable milk occean (*dugdhodsindhu*), the cause of the attainment of fortune (*Lakṣmī samprāptihetuḥ*), which was the army (*sainya*) of glorious Īśānavarman, a very moon among the kings (*kṣitipati-śaśinaḥ*). This claim of the family record in absence of any divergent claim of the hostile Maukharīs appears to be a historical fact. On the basis of his journey to Prayāga[24] Dr. Tripathi[25] has observed, that "after

---

20. *DKM.*, *P.* 163.
21. *THK.*, *P.* 43; *DKM.*, *pp.* 166-7.; *PHAI.*, *Sixth Ed.*, *Pp.* 604-5.
22. *CII.*, *Vol. III*, *No.* 42, *Pp.* 205*f.*
23. *Ibid.*, *Vol. III*, *No.* 42, *Pp.* 205*f.*
24. 'शौर्यसत्य व्रतधरो यः प्रयागगतो' *Ibid.*, *No.* 42, *pp.* 203*f.*
25. *THK.*, *P.* 43. *He comes to this conclusion on the basis of an information in the inscription that he ended his life there. To quote the learned scholar, "there are indications that his funeral rites took place there." There are several examples of such rites being performed at this holy place of our country.*

this victory Kumāragupta even pushed his territories as far west as Prayāga, where his funeral rites were observed."[26]

Thus the success of Kumāragupta over Maukharis under Īśānavarman was of tremendous importance, and, as Dr. R. C. Majumdar puts it, it "certainly must have paved the way for the rise in the fortunes of his family[28]."

DĀMODARAGUPTA

Kumāragupta's successor was Dāmodaragupta. He., unfortunately, could not reap the harvest of the victory of his father over the Maukharis, and, we learn from the Aphsaḍ inscription that his hostility against the Maukharis proved fatal to him. It says that he, "breaking up the proudly stepping array of mighty elephants, belonging to the Maukharis, which had thrown aloft in battle the troops of the Hūṇas, he became unconscious."[29]

---

26. *In light of these evidences it is difficult to understand as to why Dr. R. K. Mukherjee says that it was a victory of Īśānavarman. Harṣa, Pp.* 54-55. *Similar views are expressed by N. Ray. Cal. Rev., Vol. XXVI, Feb.,* 1928., *P.* 207. *Dr. Tripathi says such "conclusion seems utterly unwarranted." THK, P.* 43; *Fleet., CII, Vol. III, Pp.* 203-6, *Note-3.; Sinha, DKM., P.* 168.; *PHAI., Sixth Ed., P.* 605.; *Aravamuthan, P.* 90; *Pires, Pp.* 784-5. *The ceremony that was performed also indicates his victory.* अम्भसीव करीषाग्नौ मग्नः स पुष्पपूजितः' *CII., III, P.* 207, *Line* 7. *It does not indicate his defeat at all.*

27. *Both Aravamuthan (Kāveri, Maukharī and Sangam Age, P.* 90) *and Pires (The Maukharis, Pp.* 85*f*) *agree that the defeat of Īśānavarman might have taken place in the later years of his reign. Dr. Sinha says it took place about* 560 *A. D. DKM., P.* 170.

28. *CA., P.* 72; *DKM., Pp.* 168-70.

29. *CII., Vol. III, No.* 42, *P.* 203 *and* 206 *lines* 8-9. "येन दामोदरेणेव दैत्या इव हतः द्विषः ॥ यो मौखरेः सनितिषद्धतहूण सैन्या-वल्गद्धटा विघटयन्नुरुवारणानां सम्मूर्छितः" *Fleet concludes that he "expired in the fight." Ibid., P.* 206. *Dr. Tripathi has supported the view held by Fleet. THK., Pp.* 44-5. *Majumdar does not come to any definite conclusion and says that it was the victory of Later Guptas. CA., Pp.* 72*f*. *Dr. K. Chattopadhyaya, on the other hand, feels that Dāmodaragupta later on recovered. Bhandarkar Commemoration Vol., Pp.* 181*f*.

This evidence of the Aphsaḍ inscription clearly shows that the defeat of Īśānavarman at the hands of Kumāragupta was completely avenged and that it resulted in the death of Dāmodaragupta on the battlefield. The Maukharī ruler who avenged the defeat of Īśānavanman was his son Sarvavarman.[30] This defeat[31] was a serious set-back to the Later Guptas and the Maukharīs extended their actual control over "Magadha or at least its western portions."[32]

MAHĀSENAGUPTA

Mahāsenagupta was the son and successor of Dāmodargupta who

---

30. *THK., P.* 45.; *DKM., P.* 173.; *CII, Vol. III, No.* 47, *Pp.* 219-20; *Pires, Pp.* 90-1; *Aravamuthan, P.* 92; *Mukherjee, Harṣa, P.* 55; *Basak is not conclusively definite in his approach and says that "the victory over Dāmodaragupta may have been scored either by Īśānavarman himself or by his son Sarvavarman." HNEI, Pp.* 214-5. *Dr. Raychaudhary, too, says that the Maukharī opponent of Dāmodaragupta was either Sūryavarman or Sarvavarman, if not Īśānavarman himself. PHAI., Sixth Ed., P.* 605, *footnote* 5. *But epigraphic evidences and other scholarly opinions, as cited above, do not allow such doubts to stand any more.*

31. *Dr. Tripathi, referring to the result of the battle, has rightly observed, "He is reported to have been killed on the battlefield itself."* (*THK., P.* 45); *Basak also holds the similar views.* (*HNEI., P.* 114-5); *History of Bengal, Vol. I., Pp.* 57*f.*; *Aravamuthan, P.* 92; *Sinha, DKM., P.* 174.; *CA., P.* 72; *PHAI.,* 6*th Ed, P.* 606. *On the other hand, some other scholars opine that Dāmodaragupta was victorious in the battle, but did not live to enjoy the gains of the victory. Majumdar, History of Bengal, Vol. I, Pp.* 57*f.*; *Aravamuthan, P.* 92; *DKM., P.* 174; *CA., P.* 72, *Note* 2. *Chattopadhyaya's views* (*Bhandarkar Com. Vol., Pp.* 181*f.*) *are refuted by Dr. Raychaudhary. PHAI.,* 6*th Ed., P.* 606, *footnote* 1.

32. *THK., P.* 45. *Dr. Tripathi's reliance on the testimony of Deo-Baranark inscription seems well-founded.*

shifted to Mālvā or Eastern Mālvā[33] and settled there.[34] But he continued to be in possession of the eastern part of the Gupta empire and thus brought under his sway "the extensive dominions from Mālvā to East Bengal."[35]

He was wise and tactful. In order to consolidate his position he married his sister Mahāsenaguptā to Ādityavardhan of the family of Puṣpabhūtis of Thāneśvara.[36] This matrimonial alliance must have taken place about 565 A. D. or a little earlier.[37] Thus Mahāsenagupta had a strong ally on the western front in order to check any onslaught from that side. Now he decided to secure his position in the east and, therefore, led a successful expedition against Susthitavarman of Kāmarūpa.[38] This

---

33. *Mālvā or Eastern Mālvā refers to one and the same region corresponding to the Vidiśā district on the river Vetravatī whereas region adjoining to Ujjain denoted Western Mālvā. THK., P.* 45.

34. *Ibid., P.* 46; *CA., P.* 73; *Dr. Pandey, Prachīn Bhārat, P.* 263. *But Dr. Sinha, relying on the posthumous victory (?) of Dāmodaragupta, believes that his successor Mahāsenagupta continued his hold over Magadha and it was from there he defeated Susthitavarman of Kāmarūpa. According to him this conquest over Kāmarūpa could not have been possible had he been shifted to Mālvā. The learned scholar opines that he (Mahāsenagupta) retired to Mālvā in the end of his career. DKM., P.* 174. *Dr. Raychaudhary also holds the similar views. PHAI., Sixth Ed., P.* 606.

35. *CA., P.* 73.

36. *CII., Vol. III, P.* 15 *and No.* 52, *Pp.* 232*f*; *Ep. Ind., I, Pp.* 73*f*; *DKM., P.* 175. *This alliance 'was probably due to his fear of the rising power of the Maukharis and perhaps of other aggressive states mentioned in the beginning of the fourth Uchchhavāsa of Harṣacharita." PHAI., Sixth Ed., P.* 606, *footnote* 2. *Virji, Ancient History of Saurāṣṭra, P.* 48, *footnote* 4.

37. *DKM., P.* 175, *Note* 3.

38. *Dr. Mukherjee, however, says that Susthitavarman was a Maukharī. Harṣa, P.* 55. *fn.* 2.; *HCCTH., Pref. P. XI.*; *CII., Vol. III, No.* 42, *Pp.* 203 *and* 206. *But these assumptions do not carry much weight with them. Susthitavarman appears to be a king of Kāmarūpa. Ep. Ind., XII, Pp.* 74 *and* 77.; *CA., P.* 73; *THK., Pp.* 47-48; *PHAI., Sixth Ed., P.* 607, *footnote* 1.

was a complete success as we learn from the Aphsaḍ inscription that "his brilliant fame (*sphītaṃ yaśo*) was still sung (*gīyate*) on the banks of the river Lauhitya" (*Lauhityasya taṭeṣu*).[39] This conquest was an achievement of great political significance and it extended the overlordship of the Later Guptas under Mahāsenagupta over Northern Bengal and some parts of Brahmaputrā Valley. It was thus under the gifted command of Mahāsenagupta, the Later Guptas were the masters of a mighty kingdom stretching from Mālvā to Brahmaputrā Valley.

But his brilliant military career did not last long and he soon had to face many successive reverses. The first in this series was probably at the hands of the Maukharīs.[40] This was soon followed by those of the Valabhī ruler Śīlāditya[41] and Kalachuri king Śaṅkargaṇa.[42] From Bāṇa's reference to Prabhākaravardhana that he was 'an axe to the creeper of Mālvā's glory',[43] it appears that Prabhākaravardhana lent some support

---

39. *Aphsaḍ Ins. CII., Vol. III, No.* 42, *Pp.* 203 *and* 206; *Pandey, Lit. and Hist. Ins, P.* 151; *Upadhyaya, A study of Ins., P.* 83; *ASIRC, Vol. XV., P.* 11; *THK., Pp.* 47-48.

40. *According to Deo-Baranark inscription Sarvavarman and his successor Avantīvarman were in possession of some part of Magadha. CII., Vol. III. No.* 46. *Pp.* 213, 18. *This is further supported by Nālandā seals of Sarvavarman, Avantivarman and others. Ep. Ind., XIX., P.* 73; *Ibid., XXIV, Pp.* 283*f. This might have been the result of the persistent efforts of the Maukharīs under Sarvavarman. On the authority of Mahākuṭa pillar inscription of Mangleśa* (*Ind. Ant., XIX, Pp.* 7*f*), *Dr. Sinha says that Chālukya king Kīrtivarman's rival in Magadha might have been Mahāsenagupta. According to Fleet Kīrtivarman's claims were mere boast.* (*Bom. Gazetteer, Vol. I, Part II, P.* 346). *But if it is taken as a valid claim, it was against Maukharīs. CA., P.* 73.

41. *Ind. Ant., Vol. LXII, Pp.* 121*f.*; *Watters, Vol. P.* 242; *Beal, Vol. II, P.* 260; *CA., P.* 63; *EHI., P.* 344; *Proceed. of All-India Oriental Conf.* (9*th*), *Pp.* 659*ff.*

42. *Ep. Ind., Vol. IX, Pp.* 296*f*; *JBORS., Vol. XIX, Pp.* 399*f*; *Ep. Ind., II, Pp.* 21*ff*; *Ibid., Vol. VI, Pp.* 294*ff*; *Ibid., Vol. XII, Pp.* 30*ff.*

43. *HCCTH., P.* 101.

to Mahāsenagupta, but it could not change the tide and Mahāsenagupta lost all the battles. These defeats combined with intrigues of Devagupta, probably a scion of his own family, made his prospects for survival utterly hopeless. It is also possible, as Dr. Sinha has suggested,[44] that he died in the battle. Whatever the case may be, his two sons Kumāragupta and Mādhavagupta were placed under the guardianship of Prabhākaravardhana.[45]

The Kalachuris could not retain for long their control over the kingdom of Mālvā. They were ultimately defeated by the Maitrakas and the latter became the masters of Mālvā.[46] Mahāsenagupta could never survive after this period and we hear almost nothing about him. He, most probably, was killed in some battle.[47]

2. *THE MAUKHARĪS OF KĀNYAKUBJA*

During this political confusion that followed the fall of Imperial Guptas, the Maukharīs, like the Later Guptas, also attempted for supremacy in Northern India. And, like the Later Guptas, as we have seen above, they were also eager to enlist themselves as the aspirants for the hegemony over Northern India. The conflict between the Later Guptas and the Maukharīs was thus natural. On one hand, it was a "struggle between the waning glories of Magadha and the rising power of Kanauj,"[48] and on

---

44. *DKM., P.* 192.

45. *HCCTH., P.* 119. *We learn from Banskhera Inscription that Prabhākaravardhana's mother was Mahāsenaguptā. Probably she was Mahāsengupta's sister and thus Prabhākaravardhana was Mahāsenagupta's nephew. CA.,* 74; *DKM., P.* 175.; *CII., Vol. III, No.* 52, *Pp.* 231*f.*; *Ep. Ind., Vol. I, Pp.* 73*ff. With this near relationship he might have felt that his sons were well protected at his nephews court. Bāṇa clearly refers to Prabhākarvardhana's regards for these two sons. HCCTH., P.* 119.; *PHAI., Sixth Ed., P.* 606.

46. *Dr. Virji, Ancient History of Saurāṣṭra* : *The Maitrakas of Valabhī, Pp.* 47-8.

47. *DKM., P.* 192; *JBORS., Vol. XIX, Pp.* 399*ff.*

48. *THK., P.* 24.

the other, it was between the Maukharīs and the Later Guptas. This fateful struggle between the Later Guptas and the Maukharīs is rightly called as "the most arresting feature of the major portion of the sixth century A.D.", and it ultimately "ended in transforming the political centre of gravity from Pāṭaliputra to Kanauj."[49]

This sudden rise of the Maukharīs from "obscurity to great importance" is necessary to understand the political background that ultimately proved a major factor in establishing Harṣa's paramount supremacy over Northern India.

Haraha inscription[50] informs that "the Mukhera princes, (who have vanquished their foes and checked the course of evil), are the descendants of the hundred sons, whom, king Aśvapati[51] got from Vaivasvata (Manu),[52] and who were conspicuous on account of their excellences."[53] Dr. Tripathi has rightly observed that Indian literature knows many Aśvapatis and it is really difficult to determine as to whom reference is made in the Haraha inscription.[54] The latter associates the Maukharīs

---

49. *Ibid., P.* 24.

50. *Ep. Ind., Vol. XIV, Pp.* 113*f.*

51. *One Aśvapati was brother-in-law of Daśaratha. Rāmāyaṇa, II. I.*2.*; M. Bh. refers to him as the king of Madra and father of Sāvitrī. It is also known as a gaṇa of Pāṇini. IV. I.* 84. *There we find reference to Aśvapatis (Aśvapatya or Aśvapadi). Another Aśvapati was the king of Kaikeya. Śatpatha Brāhmaṇa. X. This Aśvapati was visited by five great theologians to whom he described his satisfaction at his state of affairs. Chhāndogyopaniṣad. V.II.*7*; Jayaswal, Hindu Polity, P.* 211*; Monier Williams, P.* 115.

52. *Ep. Ind., Vol. XIV, P.* 119, *Verse* 3*; M. Bh., III,* 296. 38*ff, cited in PHAI., Sixth Ed., P.* 603. *Dr. Raychaudhary says that Aśvapati got these hundred sons from Yama and not Manu as a boon "on the intercession of his daughter Sāvitrī. PHAI., Sixth Ed., P.* 603, *also footnote* 2.

53. *Ep. Ind., Vol. XIV, Pp.* 111*f.*

54. *Dr. R. C. Majumdar inclines to identify this Aśvapati, the progenitor of Maukharīs, with that of the Mahābhārata who was the king of Madra country in Central Punjab. CA., P.* 67.

with the Solar race.[55] Bāṇa also gives some hint of their origin from the sun. He says that the 'marriage of Rājyaśrī united the two brilliant lines of the Puṣpabhūtis and Maukharīs like that of Lunar and Solar houses.[56] Both Pāṇini[57] and Patañjali[58] seem to have been familiar with the Maukharīs.

On the basis of a clay seal[59] it can be safely concluded that they were important people as early as the third century B.C.. Further epigraphic evidences[60] prove the existence of many Maukharī families in Rājasthan in the third century A.D.. Thus the Maukharīs, on the basis of literary and epigraphic evidences, prove their existence from about the fifth century

---

55. *Ep. Ind., Vol. XIV, Pp.* 111*f.; THK., P.* 29.

56. "सोमसूर्यवंशाविव पुष्पभूति मुखरवंशो" *Cowell and Thomas translate this as "two lines of Puṣpabhūtis and Mukhera like that of the sun and moon houses. But the reference in the Harṣacharita shows that the Maukharīs belonged to the solar line and the Puṣpabhūtis to that of the Lunar one. "Sūryavaṁśa" certainly stands for "Mukhera." HCCTH., P.* 128*; And on this basis of wrong translation, Mr. N. Ray tried to prove that the Maukharīs belonged to Somavaṁśa or the Lunar race. Calcutta Review, Feb.,* 1928, *Vol. XXVI, No.* 2, *P.* 203*; Vaidya, HHMI., Vol. I, P.* 335.

57. *Pāṇini, IV. I.* 79.

58. *Mahābhāṣya, V. ii.* 107, *Ed. Kielhorn, P.* 397*; JBORS., March,* 1934.

59. *Fleet has observed, "The great antiquity of this family is shown by a clay-seal in General Cunningham's possession obtained at Gayā which has on it, in Aśokan characters, the Pāli legends "Mokhalinaṁ", (of the Mokhalis, Maukhalis, or Maukharīs). CII., Vol. III, Intro., P.* 14. *On this basis, it has also been attempted by Gen. Cunningham that there was some connection between the Mauryas and the Maukharīs. ASIRC., Vol. XV, P.* 166. *But Dr. Tripathi has ruled out any such possibility and he says that there is no "substantial ground' for such a conclusion. THK., P.* 28.

60. *Ep. Ind., Vol. XXIII, Pp.* 42*f.; Ibid., Vol. XXIII, Pp.* 42*f; Ibid., Vol. XXIV, Pp.* 251.*; THK., P.* 27.

B.C.[61] to the fifth century A.D.[62] extending their sway over an area from Punjāb to Magadha.[63]

YAJÑAVARMAN, ŚĀRDŪLAVARMAN AND ANANTAVARMAN

Three inscriptions[64] discovered in Gayā District throw light on three successive generations of the Maukharīs who won prominence in the early history of the family.

Yajñavarman was first of them. He was succeeded by his son Śārdūlavarman. The latter was succeeded by his son Anantavarman. It is, probably, during the time of this last ruler the family got some eminence as we learn that he is said to have "adorned by his own birth the family of the Maukharīs."[65]

The common titles of these rulers as "nṛipa" clearly show that they were feudatories[66] and as such were ruling over some part of the Gayā District.

HARIVARMAN

But we do not know anything pertaining to the successors of Anantavarman till we come to the time of Harivarman, who successfully laid down the foundations of the Maukharī kingdom with capital at Kanauj.[67]

---

61. *Pāṇini is assigned this date and it is now generally accepted.*

62. *Ep. Ind., Vol. VI, P.* 3.*; Ind. Ant., Vol. XIII, P.* 428, *note* 55*; Ibid., Vol. XLVI, P.* 127.

63. *Mokaris also find mention in the Chandravalli stone inscription of the Kadamba king Mayūraśarman. Arch. Survey of Mysore, Annual Report,* 1929, *Pp.* 50*f.*

64. *CII., Vol. III, Nos.* 48, 49 *and* 50, *Pp.* 221-228.

65. *CII., Vol. III, No.* 48, *Pp.* 222-223.

66. *THK., P.* 32. *Dr. Tripathi opines that their suzerain at that time were the Later Guptas. THK., P.* 32.

67. *JRAS.,* 1903, *Pp.* 554*f.; Dr. Tripathi's opinion that Kanauj was the seat of Maukharis since the very days of Harivarman appears to be conclusively final. THK., Pp.* 32-36.

The Haraha inscription and Asīragarha seal[68] of Sarvavarman give us an impression that his political attainments won for him much honour and respect among his contemporaries.[69] But his simple title does not determine anything pertaining to his independent status.[70]

ĀDITYAVARMAN

His successor was his son Ādityavarman by his queen Devī Jayasvāminī. He also assumed the title of Mahārāja but it speaks of no better political status as compared to that of his father. But his marriage with princess Harṣagupta, sister of king Harṣagupta of the Later Gupta dynasty shows that the Maukharīs were getting recognition as a rising power in the time of Later Guptas.

Ādiyavarman is said to have championed the cause of Varṇāśramavyavasthā[71] and gained religious merit by performing Brahmanical sacrifices.[72]

ĪŚVARAVARMAN

Ādityavarman was succeeded by his son Īśvaravarman. His wife Upaguptā was also a Gupta princess ,:nd it appears that the Maukharīs and the Later Guptas maintained friendly relations during these days. On the basis of the critical examination of the epigraphic evidences[73] we have to agree to a conclusion reached by Dr. R. S. Tripathi that he "must

---

68. *CII., Vol. III, No.* 47, *Pp.* 219-221; *Ep. Ind., Vol. XIV, Pp.* 115-119, *Verses* 4-5.

69. *Ep. Ind., Vol. XIV, P.* 115-118, *Verses* 4-5. "यो भीतेः (तैः) प्रणत स्ततश्च भुवने· · ·जगाहिरे यस्य जगन्ति रम्याः सत्कीर्त्तयः--यितव्यनाम्नः।"

70. *THK., P.* 36.

71. *Ep. Ind., Vol. XIV, P.* 116-118, *Verses* 6 *and* 7 'वर्णाश्रमाचार विधिप्रणीतेयं प्राप्य· · ·प्रसक्तम्'।

72. *Ibid., Verse* 7.

73. *Ibid., Vol. III, No.* 47 *and* 51, *Pp.* 219-21 *and* 228-30; *Ep. nd., Vol. XIV, Pp.* 112*f.*

have considerably enhanced his power and prestige"[74] and that he was "the first Maukharī king who really brought the family into prominence."[75] Dr. Mukherjee goes a step further and says that the imperial ambitions of the Maukharīs were first embodied in Īśvarvarman."[76] But his title, like that of his predecessors, indicates that he still maintained his allegiance, howsoever nominal or formal it may be, with his suzerain and remained satisfied with his feudatory status.[77]

ĪŚĀNAVARMAN

The real task of implementing the imperial designs successfully was left to his son and successor Īśānavarman by his queen Upaguptā Devī. Haraha inscription informs us that it was probably at some critical juncture he was summoned to take up the reigns of the government.[78] It enumerates his various triumphs over many rulers. It was after "conquering the lord of Āndhra who had thousands of threefold rutting elephants; vanquishing in battle the Śūlikas, who had an army of countless galloping horses; causing the Gauḍas, living on the sea-shore, in furture to remain within their proper realm," Īśānavarman is said to have come to throne of the Maukharī kingdom[79].

Attempts have been made to identify these powers who came into clash with him. His opponent in Āndhra was probably Mādhava-

---

74. *THK.*, *Pp.* 37-38.

75. *Ibid.*, *P.* 38.

76. *Harṣa.*, *P.* 54.

77. *THK.*, *Pp.* 38-39.

78. *Ep. Ind.*, *Vol. XIV*, *Pp.* 117-120; *Hist. and Lit. Ins.*, *P.* 142, *Verse* 15.

79. *Ibid.*, *Verses* 12-13.
जित्वान्ध्राधिपति सहस्रगणित्रेधाक्षर द्वारणम्
व्यावल्गन्नियुताति . . .
संख्यतुरगोन्भन्नारणे शूलिकाम् (न्)
कृत्वा चायतिमी (मो) चितं स्थलभुवो गौडान्समुद्राश्रया-
नध्यासिष्ट नत क्षितीश्वरण सिंहासन यो जिती।

varman II of the Viṣṇukuṇḍin family.[80] This is further confirmed on the authority of the Jaunpur inscription of Īśvarvarman,[81] as it also refers to unfriendly relations of Maukharīs with Āndhras when Īśvarvarman, predecessor of Īśānavarman, was on the throne. The Śūlika, probably, were the rulers of the territories in south-eastern part of India near Kaliṅga.[82] The third power that came into conflict with the Maukharīs is said to be the Gauḍas. They were, at that time, ruling over south-western part of Bengāl.[83] Dr. Tripathi has suggested that "this might

---

80. *JASB.*, 1920, *Pp.* 391*f.*; *PHAI.*, *Sixth Ed.*, *Pp.* 603*f.*

81. *CII.*; *Vol. III*, *No.* 51., *Pp.* 228-30.

82. *Dr. Tripathi identifies them with Śaulikas of Bṛihatsaṁhitā*, (*XIV.* 8) *who are associated with Vidarbha and those of Mārkaṇḍey Purāṇa. THK.*, *P.* 41. *This view is further confirmed by Dr. R. C. Majumdar. CA.*, *P.* 68.; *Ind. Ant.*, *XXII.*, *P.* 189; *Fleet, on the other hand, associates them with Mūlikas of Bṛihatsamhitā* (*XIV.* 48.23). *According to him they lived in North-Eastern India. Ind. Ant.*, *Vol. XXII*, *P.* 186. *The Śūlikas and Śaulikas are associated with Aprānta* (*N. Konhan*), *Vanavāsī* (*Kanara*) *and Vidarbha* (*Berar*). *Bṛihatsaṁhitā*, *IX.*, 15, *XIV.* 8. *They are also associated with Gāndhāra. Ibid.*, *IX.*, 21, *X.*7, *XVI.*35. *cited in PHAI.* *P.* 602, *footnote* 5. *Tārānāth refers to Śūlika kingdom beyond Togara. Ind. Ant.*, *Vol. IV*, *P.* 364. *Dr. H. C. Raychaudhari says that they "were probably the Chālūkyas." PHAI.*, 6th *Ed. Pp.* 602-3, *footnote* 5. *He also cites a reference to Kulastaṁbha of the Śulki family. JRAS.*, 1912, *P.* 128.; *Bom. Gaz.*, *Vol. I*, *Part I*, *P.* 156. *and Part II*, *P.* 336. *An attempt has also been made to identify them with the Cholas. JAHS.*, *Vol. I.*, *Pp.* 130-31. *A Tamil work Kalingathupparani by Jayagoṇḍāna is also referred to have narrated the circumstances of Chola king's conflict with Mukri* (*the Maukharīs*). *Aravamuthan, The Kāveri, the Maukhari and the Sangam Age*, *P.* 14. *Dr. Tripathi, however, rejects this identification of Mukri with the Maukharīs. THK.*, *P.* 41. *Mukri is a place in South India. Aravamuthan, Kāverī, Maukhari and Sangam Age. Pp.* 24-26, 72.; *THK.*, *Pp.* 41-2. *The Mahākuṭa Pillar inscription also refers to Kīrtivarman I's conquest over Magadha. Ind. Ant.*, *Vol. XIX*, *Pp.* 16-20.

83. *THK.*, *P.* 42.

have been the joint venture" of Īśānavarman and his contemporary Gupta ruler.[84]

It was, probably, after these successive triumphs he assumed the title of Mahārājādhirāja.[85] As we have seen earlier this was the immediate cause of the struggle between the Maukharīs and the Later Guptas[86] and proved fatal to the Maukharīs.

It was, however, a temporary phase and the table was soon turned when Īśānavarman was succeeded by Sarvavarman on the Maukharī throne.[87] He successfully avenged the defeat and death of his father. Dāmodaragupta was killed in the battle and the defeat of his army was decisive.[88] This victory of Sarvavarman over the Later Guptas was a brilliant success. As its result he succeeded in annexing "Magadha or at least, its western portion."[89] After

---

84. *Ibid., Pp.* 42-43.

85. *Ibid., P.* 43.

86. *Dr. Majumdar, however, opines that the struggle between the two was "for the remnant of the Gupta Empire." CA., Pp.* 68*f.*

87. *A reference to his another son, Sūryavarman, is found in the Haraha inscription (Ep. Ind., Vol., XI, P.* 185*); but other family records do not make any mention of him. This is explained by Dr. Tripathi who says "that either he predeceased his father, or there was a struggle for succession, and Sūryavarman being worsted in the fight was ousted or put to death." THK., P.* 44. *Dr. Raychaudhary identifies him with Sūryavarman of the Sirpur stone inscription of Mahāśivagupta (Ep. Ind., Vol. XI, Pp.* 185*f.*)*; PHAI., 3rd. Ed., P.* 407, *fn.* 3. *Similar views are expressed by Pires. The Maukharis, P.p* 86*f. But his views are also based on the same Sirpur stone inscription of Mahāśivagupta. Like Dr. Tripathi, Aravamuthan also suggests the possibility of a conflict for throne and "Sūryavarman might have been worsted by his brother." Aravamuthan, the Kāveri, the Maukharī and the Sangam Age, P.* 92.

88. *CII., Vol. III, No.* 42, *P.* 206.*; THK., P.* 45.*; Sinha, DKM., P.* 173*; Aravamuthan, op. sit., P.* 92*; Mukherjee, Harṣa, P.* 55*; Pires, op. cit., Pp.* 84-85.

89. *CII., Vol. III, Pp.* 216-18*; THK., P.* 45.

Dāmodaragupta's death his son and successor Mahāsenagupta shifted to Mālvā.[90]

AVANTIVARMAN

The problem of succession after Sarvavarman is a knotty one. The view that Susṭhitavarman succeeded Sarvavarman,[91] has now been rejected and is taken as untenable and unwarranted.[92] Avantivarman is generally accepted as an immediate successor to Sarvavarman.[93] Under

---

90. *THK., P.* 45, *Dr. Pandey, Prāchina Bhārata, P.* 263; *Upadhyaya Gupta Sāmrājya Kā Itihāsa, Vol. I., P.* 165. *As already referred to earlier Dr. Sinha opines that Mahāsenagupta retired to Mālvā in the end of his career. DKM., P.* 174.

91. *This view is based on an incorrect reading of the Aphṣaḍ inscription. CII., Vol. III, Pp.* 203*f, also Intro., P.* 15. *The learned editors of the Harṣacharita of Bāṇa also hold similar views. HCCTH., Pref., P. XI, fn.* 3. *They probably did not notice a reference to Susṭhitavarman in Bāṇa's Harṣacharita itself* (*HCCTH., P.* 217) *where he is clearly said do have belonged to Kāmarūpa. Also see Dr. Mukherjee, Harṣa, P.* 55; *C. V. Vaidya, HMHI., Vol. I, Pp.* 33-34.

92. *Dr. Tripathi has discussed this problem in detail. THK., Pp.* 47-49. *He concludes "the trend of evidence favours the elimination of Susṭhitavarman from the Maukharī genealogy." THK., P* 49; *Aravamuthan, op. cit., Pp.* 93-94; *JBORS.,* 1928, *Pp.* 254*f; Ibid., Vol. IV, Pp.* 151*f; Ep. Ind., Vol. XII, Pp.* 65*f.; Ibid., Vol. XIX, Pp.* 151*f; Pires has also discussed it at length.* (*op. cit., Pp.* 95-102) *and says that he was not at all a Maukharī prince. Ibid., Pp.* 95-102.

93. *Avantivarman's relationship with Sarvavarman is not known on the basis of family records. Dr. Tripathi assumes that Avantivarman was son of Sarvavarman. THK., P.* 49. *Coming to such assumption he argues that "there is no case in the Maukharī dynasty of a brother succeeding a brother" and "it may be tentatively assumed that Avantivarman was son of Sarvavarman. Ibid., P.* 49. *This opinion gets some support from the Nālandā seal of Avantivarman. Ep. Ind., Vol. XXIV, Pp.* 283*f; Sinha, DKM., P.* 204; *Woolner Com. Vol., P.* 116; *Basak, HNEI., P.* 117.

Avantivarman the Maukharis continued to enjoy great strength and full independent status.

We learn from the Nālandā seal[94] that Avantivarman assumed all high-sounding imperial titles which are amply justified by his empire he governed.

It was, probably, during the reign of Avantivarman the Maukharī power reached its highest water-mark. Bāṇa says that "they (the Maukharīs) stood at the head of all royal houses and were worshipped, like Śiva's foot-print, by all the world."[95] Avantivarman, according to Bāṇa, was the pride of that race of the Maukharīs.[96] Commenting on Bāṇa's description, Dr. R. C. Majumdar has rightly observed that "even allowing for poetic exaggeration, particularly when the occasion was a matrimonial alliance of his patron's family with the Maukharīs, Bāṇabhaṭṭa's eulogy undoubtedly conveys the idea that the Maukharī rulers enjoyed great power and distinction up to the beginning of the seventh century A.D."[97]

GṚAHAVARMAN

Avantivarman was succeeded by his eldest son Gṛahavarman.[98]

---

94. *Ep. Ind., Vol. XXIV, Pp.* 283-5.

95. *HCCTH., P.* 122. धरणीधराणां च मूर्ध्नि स्थितो माहेश्वरः पादन्यास इव सकल भुवननमस्कृतो मौखरिवंशः।" ह० च०, च० उच्छ०, पृ० १३।

96. *Ibid., P.* 122. "तत्रापि तिलकभूतस्यावन्तिवर्मणः"—ह० च०, च०, उच्छ०, पृ० १३।

97. *CA., P.* 69.

98. *HCCTH., P.* 122; हर्ष चरित, चतुर्थ उच्छ्वास, पृ० १३। *The Nālandā seal (Ep. Ind., Vol., XXIV, Pp. 284ff.) has raised an important controversy pertaining to the problem of succession after Avantivarman. As the seal is damaged, it cannot be read fully, but its first letter is 'Su' and the second appears to be 'Va' or 'Cha'. Dr. Chakravarty has tried to suggest that it may be taken as "Śrī suchandra." This has created a puzzle which is difficult to be solved. Here Āryā-Mañju-Śrī-Mūlakalpa comes to our help and informs us that Gṛahavarman was succeeded by 'Suva'. This, however, is not confirmed by any other source. But if this is believed the name in Nālandā seal cannot be "Suchandra". But the*

Bāṇa says that he had all the virtues of his father[99] and was like the lord of the planets descended upon earth.[100] Our knowledge of Grahavarman's personal and political achievements is meagre and confined to Harṣacharita of Bāṇa. We know of his marriage with Puṣpabhūti princess Rājyaśrī. This alliance between the Puṣpabhūtis and the Maukharīs was of great political importance. This was also realized at that time, as we are told by Bāṇa that a wise and learned Brāhmaṇa, named Gaṁbhīra, said to Grahavarman, "My son, by obtaining you Rājyaśrī has at length united the two brilliant lines of Puṣpabhūtis and Mukhara, whose worth, like that of the sun and moon houses is sung by all the world to the gratification of

---

Nālandā seal completely omits Grahavarman and informs that Avantivarman was directly succeeded by 'Suva' (or 'Sucha'). But Bāṇa's Harṣacharita makes it definitely clear that Grahavarman succeeded Avantivarman as the ruler of Kanauj. It has been suggested that 'Suva' or 'Sucha' was another son of Avantivarman who occupied the throne before Harṣa extended his actual control over Kanauj. (Ep. Ind., Vol. XXIV, Pp. 283f.). This possibility does not reconcile with an information furnished by Yuan Chwang (Watters, I, P. 343; Beal, I, P. 313). Now there are only two other possibilities which have not received the attention of learned scholars. Firstly, there might have been a war of succession after the death of Avantivarman and his son 'Suva' or 'Sucha' might have received initial success in declaring himself as the master of Magadha whereas Grahavarman remained satisfied with Kanauj kingdom and sought Rājyaśrī's hand in order to consolidate his position with an idea to punish 'Suva' or 'Sucha'. But his untimely death, however, did not allow him to implement it. Secondly, 'Suva' or 'Sucha', following the murder of Grahavarman and Rājyavardhana II, might have declared himself as an heir to the Maukharī throne. This position might have lasted till the political confusion continued, but as soon as Harṣa took over the reins of government 'Suva' ('Sucha') might have been ousted or he himself preferred voluntary abdication.

99. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 122. 'पितुरन्यूनो गुणैरेनां' ह० च०, च० उ०, पृ० १३।

100. *HCCTH.*, *Pp.* 122-3; ह० च०, च० उ०, पृ० १३। *This analogy with the lord of the planets appears to give an impression that it indicates to his status as a suzerain and sovereign ruler.*

wise men's ears."[101] The political history of northern India, afterwards, justifies this statement of Bāṇa as put in Gaṁbhīra's mouth. It was "largely instrumental in shaping the course of history during that momentous period."[102]

The closing years of the sixth century and the early period of the seventh century A.D. witnessed a diplomatic revolution in the history of northern India, and matrimonial alliances played a major part in changing the course of history of that period. We have seen that the Later Guptas of Magadha and the Maukharīs of Kanauj were on unfriendly and rival terms in the initial stages. Though this rivalry of a traditional nature existed till the Later Guptas shifted to Mālvā under Mahāsenagupta. But the marriages between the two royal houses proved as cementing bonds. First matrimonial alliance that was negotiated between them was that of princess Harṣaguptā, sister of Harṣagupta and daughter of Jīvitatupta I with Maukharī prince Ādityavarman, son of Harīvarman. When this marriage could not prove successful as a bond of relationship and they soon were at daggers drawn, the Later Guptas turned towards the Puṣpabhūtis. The princess Mahāsenaguptā, daughter of Dāmodargupta and sister of Mahāsenagupta was married to Ādityavardhana, son of Rāiyavardhana I of the Puṣpabhūti dynasty. But the marriage of Rājyaśrī, daughter of Prabhākaravardhana with Gṛahavarman, son of Avantivarman, brought about a diplomatic revolution and accelerated the crisis. This marriage might have been a rude shock to the family of the Later Guptas and probably with the death of Mahāsenagupta who placed his two sons at Harṣa's court, the old relationship faded away. Their old ties were broken and an unholy alliance was formed between the Devagupta and the Gauḍa king Śaśāṅka.[103] This Gupta-Gauḍa axis, formed so unscrupulously, resulted in treacherous murder of Gṛahavarman. With the death of Gṛahavarman we come to an end of the line of the Maukharīs. Kingdom

---

101. *HCCTH., P.* 128.

102. *THK., P.* 51.

103. *PHAI., 6th Ed., P.* 605. *A detailed survey of these events will be made later.*

of Kanauj was ultimately annexed to that of Thāneśvara and some persons of the family of Grahavarman survived as petty nobles and are said to have entered into matrimonial alliances with the family of the Later Guptas.[104]

3. *THE PUṢPABHŪTIS OF THĀNEŚVARA*

After the decline and fall of the Later Guptas and the tragic assassination of the Maukharī prince Grahavarman the task of maintaining law and order and giving India an efficient administration and enlightened government fell upon the Puṣpabhūtis of Thāneśvara.

Though ill-starred, they succeeded in laying the foundations of the most powerful kingdom in northern India at a very critical moment in Indian history. The emperor Harṣa not only succeeded in founding a great empire but his age is also regarded as one of epoch-making importance in many ways.

The family of the Puṣpabhūtis had a modest beginning at Sthāṇvīśvara in the Śrīkaṇṭha Janapada. The founder of the line was Puṣpabhūti. The family was named after him and came to be known as the Puṣpabhūtivaṁśa. He was a great devotee of Śiva and was called Paramamāheśvara.

He came into contact with a south Indian Śaivite saint named Bhairavāchārya. With his assistance and under his guidance Puṣpabhūti performed a great ceremony called 'Mahākālahṛidaya' at cemetery. The goddess appeared there and anointed the king. She also blessed the king with a boon and declared that he "shall be the founder of a mighty line of kings....wherein shall arise an emperor named Harṣa, governor like Hariśchanda....world-conquering like a second Māndhātrī.[1]

Bāṇa does not tell us anything about the immediate successors of Puṣpabhūti. He tells us that many kings were born in that line, and then suddenly comes to Prabhākaravardhana.

Epigraphic evidences add to our knowledge some information about some of the successors of Puṣpabhūti. They are Naravardhana,

---

104. *PHAI., Sixth Ed., P.* 605, *fn.* 2.

1. *HCCTH., P.* 97.

Rājyavardhana I and Ādityavardhana. These rulers made their best efforts to lay the solid foundations of the Puṣpabhūti kingdom. Both Narvavardhana and Rājyavardhana I assumed the title of 'Mahārāja' and it appears that they must have enjoyed some political importance during their times.

In the time of Ādityavardhana the dynasty appears to have enhanced its prestige and power and this is clear from the marriage of Rājyavardhana I with Mahāsenaguptādevī, sister of Mahāsenagupta of the Later Gupta dynasty. This is rightly said to have marked "a definite step in their rise to power and importance."[2] The Puṣpabhūtis were on their way to establish an independent rule which was fully materialised during the times of Prabhākaravardhana, son and successor of Ādityavardhana. We shall deal with all these rulers in detail later and shall try to assess their political achievements in the next chapter which deals with the family and heritage of Harṣa.

4. *THE MAITRAKAS OF VALABHĪ*

While discussing the facts underlying the fall of the Imperial Guptas we have seen how Maitrakas of Valabhī embarked upon a way to set up an independent existence,[1] and of all the ruling dynasties that established their principalities taking an advantage of the weakness of the declining and decaying Gupta power the Maitrakas proved successful in establishing a kingdom enduring for a long time.

BHAṬĀRKA

Bhaṭāraka or Śrī-Bhaṭārka[2] who laid down the foundations of the Valabhī kingdom, belonged to a family known as Maitrakas,[3] a kṣatriya

---

2. *CA., P.* 97.

1. *Supra. P.* 5.

2. *Dr. K. Virji refers to several variants of Bhaṭārka such as 'Bhaṭāka', Bhaṭārkka, Bhaṭṭārkka, Bhaṭṭakka, Bhaṭakka, Bhaṭārka; Bhaṭṭārka etc. Anc. Hist. of Saurāṣṭra: The Maitrakas of Valabhī, Bom.,* 1955, *P.* 25, *fn.* 2.

3. *Ind. Ant., Vol. I, P.* 14; *Ibid., Vol. XIV, P.* 327; *JBBRAS., Vol. XI, P.* 346.

clan[4] and started his career as the Governor of Saurāṣṭra. He only maintained nominal allegiance to the Imperial Guptas and paved the way for an independent rule.

This fateful decision proved a turning point in the history of Saurāṣṭra.[5] But he still remained 'Senāpati'[6] and did not assume any royal title such as 'Mahārāja' or 'Mahārājādhirāja'. It appears that he also transferred his capital from Girinagar to Valabhī.[7]

DHARASENA I

Bhaṭārka's reign came to an end about 493 A.D. and he was succeeded by his eldest son Dharasena I who ruled up to 499 A.D.

Dharasena I (c. 493-499 A.D.) might have made some attempst of attaining a greater degree of autonomy and independence; but he, too, like his father, retained the title of Senāpati[8]. This shows that he still maintained the usual nominal subservience to the Imperial Guptas and did not declare complete independence. He also did not assume the title of Mahārāja. This was left to his younger brother Droṇa Siṁha who appears to have succeeded Dharatena I about 499 A.D.

DROṆA SIṂHA

Droṇa Siṁha (c.A.D. 499-519) appears to have assumed the full status of a king with royal title of Mahārāja soon after he came to throne.[9] He formally "celebrated his coronation ceremony in the presence

---

4. *Ind. Ant., Vol. II, Pp.* 312*f; Tod, Annals. Ant. Raj., I, Pp.* 100-255; *Ojha, Rājputānā Kā Itihāsa, I, Pp.* 369-70. *Watters, II, P.* 269; *Beal II, P.* 246; *Ind. Ant., LXI, P.* 70.

5. *JBBRAS (New series)., I, Pp.* 17*ff.*

6. *CII., Vol. III, No.* 38, *Pp.* 165 *and* 167.

7. *Ep. Ind., Vol. XX, Pp.* 114*f; Bom. Gaz., I, Pt. I, Pp.* 96*ff.*

8. *CII., Vol. III, No.* 38, *Pp.* 166, 168.

9. *This is proved on the basis of his copper plate grant and other records. JBBRAS., Vol. XX, Pp.* 1*ff; Ep. Ind., Vol. XVI, Pp.* 17*ff; CII., Vol. III, No.* 38, *Pp.* 166, 168.

of the paramount sovereign himself."[10] Thus it cannot be said that under Droṇa Siṁha the Maitrakas fully "set on the course of complete independence."[11]

DHRUVASENA I

Droṇa Siṃha was succeeded by his brother Dhruvasena I (c. A.D. 519 to 549) about 519 A.D. and remained on the Valabhī throne for nearly thirty years. In one of his grants[12] it is said that "he acquired the throne by the strength of his own arms" (*Svabhujaparākrameṇa*) and this may suggest that his succession did not take placc in usual course. It is probable that he ousted his brother and wrested the throne for himself.[13] He assumed many titles. They include Mahārāja, Mahāsāmanta,[14] Mahāpratihāra, Mahādaṇḍanāyaka, and Mahākārtika.[15] We have enough epigraphic evidences of the time of Dhruvasena I and these sources

---

10. अखिलभुवनमण्डलैक—स्वामिनापरभस्वाभिना—स्वयं उपहित राज्याभिषेकः' *As referred to it elsewhere, it is suggested that, though, they had broken off their relations with the Guptas, they, still, acknowledged the supremacy of Vākāṭakas. Dr. Virji, Anc. Hist. of Saurāṣṭra, P.* 28. *But Dr. Majumdar, on the other hand, says that "there seems to be no reasonable ground to suppose that the overlord of Droṇa Siṁha could be other than Gupta emperor." CA., Pp.* 61-62.*; EHI., P.* 335*; Commissariat, History of Gujrāt, P. XXXIX; Bom. Gaz., Vol. I, Pt. I, Pp.* 88*f.; IC., Vol. V., Pp.* 409*f. Dr. Majumdar's view appears to have a factual approach. We do not find any special reason compelling the Maitrakas to shift their loyalty and allegiance. Dr. Krishnakumari Virji's arguments (Ancient History of Saurāṣṭra, Pp.* 28*f.) appear to be poor and vague.*

11. *Dr. Virji, Anc. Hist. of Saurāṣṭra, P.* 29.

12. *Ep. Ind., Vol. IV, Pp.* 104-107.

13. *Dr. Virji's arguments to rule out such possibility are not convincing, (Ancient History of Saurāṣṭra, P.* 31.) *and the expression that "his (Dhruvasena's) head was purified (pavitrīkṛata) with dust (Rajo) of his predecessor's feet appears to wipe off the possibility of this kind of an inglorious act.*

14. *Ep. Ind., Vol. XI, Pp.* 113*f; Ind. Ant., Vol. XXXIX, Pp.* 130*f.*

15. *JRAS.*, 1895, *Pp.* 382*ff.*

record[16] that he had to face some reverses in his engagements. Probably at this time of distress he also lost his son.[17] Other informations that we derive from these records are general and vague and no historical conclusions can be drawn on their basis. But one notable feature of his personality that deserves mention is that he, unlike his predecessors who all were Śaivites, was a devotee of Viṣṇu. But he was a man with generous religious views. This we learn from his grants. During his times all religions and sects got equal opportunities for an advancement of their faiths and values.[18]

DHARAPAṬṬA

His younger brother Dharapaṭṭa appears to have succeeded him some time after c.A.D. 549[19] and his rule came to an end sometime before 559 A.D.[20] His records have not yet been discovered and, surprisingly enough, no mention is made to him in the grants of his son and successor Guhasena. As he was on the Valabhī throne after the consecutive reigns of his three brothers who ruled for about half a century, Dharapaṭṭa might have been pretty old when he came to throne and naturally it might have been for a few years that he ruled over the Valabhī kingdom. Dharasena II's records refer to him as 'Mahārāja' and it appears that he kept the kingdom intact. A reference in Kavī grant of Govindarāja[21] to his success

---

16. *Ep. Ind., Vol. IV, Pp.* 104-7; *JRAS.*, 1895, *P.* 382.

17. *Sacred Books of the East, Vol. XXII, Pp.* 270*f. The great Jain Council that was convened at Valabhī expressed its condolence over this death.*

18. *Ep. Ind., Vol. III, Pp.* 318*f; JRAS.*, 1895, *Pp.* 379*f; G.V. Acharya, Hist. Ins. of Gujrat, Vol. I, P.* 40; *Ep. In., Vol. XVII, P.* 108; *Ibid., Vol. XIX, P.* 215; *JBBRAS.* (*N.S.*), *Vol. I, P.* 16*f; Ind. Ant., Vol. XLIII, P.* 176-77; *Jacobi, Kalpasūtra, Pp.* 270*f.*

19. *JUB., III, Pp.* 79*f. The last known dated record of Dharasena I is of* 545 *A. D.*.

20. *Ind. Ant., Vol. VII, Pp.* 66*f.*

21. *Ind, Ant., Vol. V, Pp.* 144*f.*

for conquering forcibly "the renowned greatness of the ranks of his enemies,"[22] most probably, indicates to his participation in the battles fought during the preceding reigns of his brothers.[23]

GUHASENA

.Guhasena (c.A.D. 553-69) succeeded his father Dharapaṭṭa. We have already seen that 'Guhasena's records do not refer to his father. It is somewhat unusual and significant and this omission cannot be dismissed as a "mistake of the writer."[24] I submit that aspirant sons of the rulers could not suppress for long their desire to be kings[25] and when they saw that Bhaṭārka was successively succeeded by his four sons, they, probably, made a common cause and helped Guhasena, son of the ruling monarch Dharapaṭṭa, to oust the latter. As Dharapaṭṭa must have been very old, the process of dethroning him might not have caused much bloodshed. The later records of the Maitrakas since the time of Śīlāditya I give the genealogy of the family beginning with Guhasena and the names of the rulers, who ruled over the Valabhī kingdom between Bhaṭārka and Guhasena are completely neglected or omitted deliberately. This omission of Dharapaṭṭa's name in the records of his son Guhasena is more than a mere "mistake of the writer" and it was certainly deliberate and intentional. This view is plausible till we do not find some record of Guhasena referring to his father Dharapaṭṭa.

Guhasena discarded the subservient title of Parambhaṭṭāraka-

---

22. *Ibid., P.* 144.

23. *Dr. Virji, Anc. Hist. of Saurāṣṭra, P.* 37.

24. *Virji, Anc. Hist. of Sau., P.* 36. *The learned writer, too, feels that "it requires to be resolved." Ibid., P.* 36.

25. *Succession of brothers at the same time cannot be ruled out altogether. Śīlāditya I appointed Kharagraha I as his successor in supercession to his son Darabhaṭa. But some special reasons might have been there for this unusual practice. According to Hindu view of treatises on polity and Government it is the right of the eldest son to succeed the father. This was a general practice and it was not observed only in exceptional cases and unusual circumstances.*

pādānudhyāta and this shows that Maitrakas under him completely broke off their relations with the Imperial Guptas. The nominal allegiance that was retained by the successors of Bhaṭārka before Guhasena ceased to continue and the Maitrakas were now completely independent masters of Saurāṣṭra.[26]

Five records of Guhasena have been discovered so far. They throw some light on his personality. He appears to be a great warrior and wise strategist. The Maliya Copper Plate inscription of Dharasena II[27] informs us that his "sword was verily a second arm (to him) from childhood, the test of whose strength was manifested by clapping his hands....on the rutting elephants of (his) foes.... (his) enemies were made to bow down by his powers....; in beauty, luster, stability, profundity, wisdom and wealth (he) surpassed (respectively) the gods Smara, the moon, the king of mountains (Himālayas), the ocean, the preceptors of gods (Bṛahaspati) and the God Dhaneśa."[28] Though these are conventional praises, common in those days, we cannot minimise the importance of Guhasena as the first Maitraka ruler who laid the solid foundations of independent Maitraka rule in Saurāṣṭra.

Dr. Virji has tried to prove on the basis of the Jaunpur stone inscription of Īśvaravarman that the latter came into conflict with the Maitraka ruler Guhasena, and she tries to prove that Guhasena "successfully repulsed his enemy" and that the latter "was driven back from Saurāṣṭra by the Great Maitraka ruler Guhasena."[29] This view has

26. *CA.*, *P.* 62.

27. *CII.*, *Vol. III*, *No.* 38, *Pp.* 164-171.

28. *Ibid.*, *Pp.* 168-9, *Lines* 10-14.

29. *Dr. Virji*, *Anc. Hist. of Saurāṣṭra*, *Pp.* 38-39. *It is, indeed, surprising to note that Dr. Virji has not said anything to prove that Īśvaravarman was contemporary to Guhasena. She has taken them for granted as contemporaries for reasons known to her alone. The basis for this conflict is provided to her by the Jaunpur stone inscription of the Maukharī ruler Īśvaravarman* (*CII.*, *Vol. III*, *No.* 51, *Pp.* 228-30). *This record says that Īśvara went to the Raivataka Mountain* (*Śamkāpareṇāsitaṁ yā to Raivatakāchalaṁ*) (*Ibid.*, *P.* 230, *Line* 7.). *Pires says*

hardly anything to justify it as the first known date of Īśānavarman, immediate successor to Īśvaravarman, is 554 A.D. (611 V.S.), we can take him to come to throne about 550 A.D.. The date of accession of Guhasena is

---

that king who faced the expedition was "probably the ruler of Valabhī" (The Maukharis, P. 73;). Tripathi does not come to any positive decision and says that "the adversary" who "went to the Raivataka mountain" are mere rhodomontade, or actually refer to some victory achieved by Īśvarvarman against these southern monarchs." THK., P. 38; If we take the preceding line of the inscription into consideration that says, "the lord of Āndhra, wholly given over to fear, took up (his) abode in the Vindhya Mountain" (Vindhyaddreḥ prati-randhraṁ-Andhrapatiṁ-Śaṁkāparenāsitaṁ Yāto Raivatakāchalaṁ) (CII., Vol. III, P. 230), *we are inclined to support the line taken by Dr. Tripathi. Fleet (CII., Vol. III, P.* 229), *however, takes a view to associate him with Saurāṣṭra or Kathiāwar. If we take it for granted that the Raivataka's reference is intended to hint Īśvaravarman's engagement with some ruler of Saurāṣṭra and probably, the Valabhī ruler, as Pires has suggested, (Op. cit., P.* 73), *the most important issue is to determine who was this Valabhī ruler ? Was he Guhasena as suggested by Virji ? (A. H. S., Pp.* 38*f.). The Jaunpur stone inscription is not dated and this has complicated the problem. Cunningham's view, that "it seems not at all improbable that this powerful king Īśvaravarman may be the I-sha-fumo of the Chinese, who is mentioned as the king of Central India in the year* 731 *A.D., appears certainly baseless in light of new researches. ASIRC., Vol. XI. P.* 25. *But scholars have fixed Īśvaravarman's chronology on the basis of Maukharī records and those of the Later Guptas. The sheet-anchor of chronology of the Maukharis is the Haraha inscription. But its dates have also variant readings, viz.* 611 *and* 589. *(Ep. Ind., XIV, P.* 118, 120, *Ver.* 21*; Ann. Rep., Luck. Museum,* 1915, *P.* 3). *If it is Vikram era, it may correspond to* 554 *and* 532 *A.D. respectively. On the basis of the coins no conclusive stand can be taken. For further details. Ind. Ant., XX, P.* 407*; JRAS.,* 1906, *P.* 849*; Ind. Ant., XLVI, P.* 126. *Dr. Tripathi, who had taken pains, also does not come to any conclusion. THK., Pp.* 55-60. *Pires who has also worked over all details (Maukharis, Pp.* 156-168) *of the Maukharī chronology, says that as Haraha ins. may be of* 611. *V.S.* (554 *A.D.), the date of accession of Īśvaravarman may be placed about* 550 *A.D. and, therefore, Īśvaravarman who was immediate predecessor of*

fixed at 553 A.D..[30] Thus, Īśānavarman was contemporary to Guhasena and his successor Dharasena.

All records of Guhasena give an idea of his great personality. He was a great general and wise administrator. His grants prove that in his time Hinduism and Vaiṣṇavism progressed side by side. His grants refer to him both as Parama Māheśvara and Paramopāsaka. This reveals that his faith was in Śaivism but he also took great interest in Buddhism. It was, probably, due to Dudda's definite inclination to Buddhism.[31]

As the earliest known date of his successor Dharasena II is c.A.D. 571,[32] we can tentatively fix the end of Guhasena's rule about 569 or 570 A.D.. He was succeeded by his son Dharasena II sometime before 571 A.D., the first known date of his time, and certainly after 567 A.D., the last known date of his father[33] and thus the date of Dharasena's succession can be fixed at 569-70 A.D..

Iśānavarman, cannot be placed after 550 *A.D. and certainly after* 545 *A.D. Dr. Majumdar also places Iśvaravarman before* 555 *A.D. and Iśānavarman about* 550-76 *A.D. CA., P.* 70. *If we accept Haraha's date as* 589 *V.S.* (532 *A.D.*) *the case for making Iśvaravarman contemporary to Guhasena becomes still poorer, and, therefore, Virvi's contention that Iśvarvarman came into conflict with Guhasena is entirely baseless and unwarranted. Therefore, Iśvaravarman naturally becomes contemporary to Dharapaṭa* (549-553). *And it was in the reign of Dharapaṭa, Iśvaravarman might have attacked the Valabhī king of Saurāṣṭra. And as Dharapaṭa, who might have been pretty old by that time, seeing the terrible army of Iśvaravarman, might have got refuge at the Raivataka mountain. Thus the conclusion reached by Virji that Iśvaravarman attacked Saurāṣṭra during Guhasena's reign is not properly reached at. In light of the above I sumbit that Iśvaravarman attacked Saurāṣṭra in the time of Dharapaṭa and the latter was defeated and took shelter at the Raivataka mountain.*

30. *AHS., P.* 38.
31. *Ind. Ant., Vol. VII, Pp.* 66*f.*
32. *And. Ant., Vol. XV, Pp.* 187*f.*
33. *Ibid., Vol. V, Pp.* 206*f.*

DHARASENA II

The early career of Dharasena II appears to have faced some reverses. This is revealed from his title of Sāmanta in his grants of 571 A.D..[34] But very soon, probably in the same year, he appears to have dropped it[35] and after a couple of years we find him again as Mahārāja.[36] This shows that in the beginning he might have faced some difficulties but soon consolidated his position.

It has been said that Dharasena II came into conflict with the Maukharis under Īśānavarman[37] but no convincing arguments have been brought before us to prove such a conclusion. No Maitraka records nor the Maukharī records help us to support such fanciful imagination. Dharasena again changes his title to Mahāsāmanta. He is said to have done so to "avert calamities that would afflict his subjects"[38] and it is not because of an aggression by Īśānavarman. The learned author should have found some satisfactory and understandable ground for such change in his titles. Had there been such a brilliant success achieved by Īśānavarman he would have certainly referred to it alongwith other successes over the Āndhras, Śūlikas and the Gauḍas.[39] It can, of course, certainly be inferred that Dharasena II might have "come to terms with his enemies" to avoid "destruction and havoc caused to his subjects."[40]

In his inscriptions he is said to have "maintained all the gifts of previous kings" and that he "could prove that Śrī (the goddess of wealth) and Sarasvatī (the goddess of wisdom) could live together in his kingdom". These epigraphic evidences indicate that his rule was uneventful and he maintained the kingdom he inherited.

---

34. *Ind., Ant., Vol. XV, Pp.* 187*f.*
35. *Ibid., Vol. VII, P.* 68.
36. *This is clear from his Bantia plates. Ep. Ind., Vol. XXI, Pp.* 179*f.*
37. *Virji., Anc. Hist. of Sau., Pp.* 43*f.*
38. *Ibid., P.* 43.
39. *Ep. Ind., XIV, Pp.* 117, 120, *verse* 13.
40. *Virji, Anc. Hist. of Sau., P.* 44*; Bom. Gaz., I, Pt. I, P.* 115.

A Palitana copper plate grant of Siṁhāditya of 574 A.D.[41] throws some light on the political supremacy of Dharasena II. It shows that Sāmanta Mahārāja Siṁhāditya belonged to a feudatory family of Gārulakas. This grant gives a genealogy of Gārulaka family beginning with Senāpati Varāhadāsa I, his two sons Bhaṭṭiśūra and Varāhadāsa II and Siṁhāditya, son of the latter. As the grant says that Varāhadāsa II defeated the ruler of Dvārkā, it appears, as Dr. Majumdar suggests, that Varāhadāsa II "fought on behalf of his overlord Guhasena II or Dharasena II."[42] It was probably under Dharasena II, and by this conquest, Dharasena might have extended his sway up to the western coast. This assumption appears to be well-founded on the basis of his Wala Plate[43] that assigns him the title of Mahādhirāja in addition to his title Mahāsāmanta-Mahārāja. As Dr. Majumdar has suggested, "his claim", most probably, depends upon his success of "extension of territory".[44]

ŚILĀDITYA I

The last known date of Dharasena II is c. A.D. 589. The problem of succession after the death of Dharasena is complicated. It is not so simple as has appeared to many scholars. Whereas the last known date of Dharasena II is 589 A.D. the first known date of Śilāditya I Dharmāditya is 605-6 A.D. as we learn from Valabhī grant.[45] He issued eleven copper plate grants and they range from 605-6 A.D. to 611-12 A.D., the last being the Bhadrenika grant of 611-12 A.D.. The man who issued eleven grants during the period of six years, on average two each year, did not issue a single grant from 590 to 606 and, therefore, it seems strange to accept Śilāditya I as successor of Dharasena II.[46]

This puzzle is partly solved by Yuan Chwang. In his accounts

41. *Ep. Ind., Vol. XI, Pp.* 16*f.*
42. *CA., P.* 63.
43. *Ind., Ant., VI, Pp.* 11*f.; CA., P.* 63, *Note* 1.
44. *CA., P.* 63.
45. *Ind. Ant., I, Pp.* 46*f.; Ep. Ind, XI, P.* 115.
46. *Virji, Pp.* 46*f.*

he refers to king Śīlāditya of Mālvā (Mo-la-po),[47] who is said to have ruled over the country sixty years before him.[48] This would place Śīlāditya somewhere between 580 and 590 A.D. but as we know it for certain that Dharasena II was on the Valabhī throne in 589 A.D., we can accept Śīlāditya as a successor to Dharasena II as the identification of Śīlāditya I Dharmaditya with Śīlāditya of Mo-la-po now appears to be an established one.[49] But the emergence of his brother Kharagraha I soon after Śīlāditya I complicates the situation as we learn that Kharagraha I succeeded Maitraka throne after Śīlāditya I in supercession to latter's son named Dherabhaṭṭa.[50] This is proved by the grants of Kharagraha I.[51] The (Bhadrenika) grant of Śīlāditya I of 611-12 A.D.[52] refers to Śīlāditya and Kharagraha I as Indra and Upendra. This, according to Dr. Sinha, gives some hint of "a dispute between the two brothers in which the younger, Kharagraha I, came out successful.[53] As there was no properly maintained convention at the Maitraka court pertaining to the law of succession,[54] it seems probable that Kharagraha I tried to wrest the Maitrika throne after Dharasena II. And as Śīlāditya I was a religious minded and virtuous man, he must have avoided bloodshed for the sake of the throne.

---

47. *Watters, Vol. II, P.* 242; *Beal, II, P.* 260.

48. *It is not clear that Yuan Chwang counts these sixty years from the time he visited India or from the date he compiled his records. If he calculates the period of sixty years from the date he compiled the record it would come to about* 590 *A.D.*.

49. *EHI., P.* 344; *CA., P.* 63; *Beal, II, Pp.* 260*f. Waters, II, Pp.* 248*f. Sylvin Levi, Journal des Savants*, 1905, *Pp.* 544-48.

50. *CII., Vol. III, No.* 39, *Pp.* 171-191.

51. *Gadre, Imp. Insc. from Baroda State, Baroda*, 1943, *Pp.* 7*f; Proceed. of VII. All-India Oriental Confe., Baroda, Pp.* 659*f; Ann. Rep. of Watson Museum*, 1933-34, *Pp.* 7*f.*

52. *EP. Ind., Vol. XXI, Pp.* 116*f.*

53. *DKM., P.* 183.

54. *This is proved by the fact that before Guhasena all four brothers ruled successively after Bhakārka.*

This might have created a state of uncertainty about the recognised succession after Dharasena II. Dr. Raychaudhary opines that "a branch of the dynasty established itself in Mo-la-po or the western-most part of Mālvā in the second half of the sixth century A.D." and the another, "a junior branch continued to rule at Valabhī."[55] It is probable that Śīlāditya remained satisfied with the kingdom of Mo-la-po and agreed to accept the control of Kharagraha I over Valabhī. This also reconciles with the accounts of Yuan Chwang.[56] By 605 A.D. a compromise might have reached between the two brothers and Kharagaraha I might have agreed to the unification of the kindgom[57] with a condition that he would succeed the Maitraka throne after the death of Śīlāditya I. As an obedient son Devabhaṭa might have honoured this commitment of his father.

As Śīlāditya I is contemporary to both Prabhākaravardhana and Harṣavardhana, we shall deal with his relations with the Puṣpabhūtis while dealing with them.

5. *THE GURJARAS*

The second half of the sixth century A.D. that precedes the rise of Harṣavardhana saw the rise of another power that made an attempt to establish its principality in north. Bāṇa says that king Prabhākaravardhana was "a troubler to the sleep of the Gurjaras."[1] This shows that the Gurjaras came into conflict with the Puṣpabhūtis before the rise of Harṣa, and a brief reference to them appears necessary.

The story of the origin of the Gurjaras has been an enigma that has baffled several scholars and they are sharply divided on this issue. Some of them regard Gurjaras of foreign descent[2] whereas others have tried

---

55. *PHAI.*, *P.* 427, *Note* 3.

56. *Watters*, *II*, 242.

57. *This is why Śīlāditya issued his grant in c.* 605 *A.D. Ind. Ant.*, *I*, *Pp.* 46*f.*; *Ep. Ind.*, *XI*, *Pp.* 115*f.*

1. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 101.

2. *ASIRC.*, *II*, *Pp.* 61*f.*; *Dr. Hoernle*, *JRAS.*, 1904, *Pp.* 639-662; *Ibid.*, 1905, *Pp.* 1-31; *also*, *JBBRAS.*, *XXI*, *Pp.* 411*f.*; *Smith*, *EHI.*, *P.* 340;

to prove their indigenous origin.[3] But nothing can be said conclusively[4] and it appears that the Gurjaras were of Indian origin, and "no definite evidence" could have been put before the learned world to prove that "they were foreigners."[5] And "the consensus of opinion seems to be in favour of their indigenous origin.[6] Thus the stand taken by Ojha, Vaidya, Ganguly and others has yet remained a substantial basis of their indigenous origin.

The earliest literary reference to Gurjaras, most probably, is in the Bāṇa's Harṣacharita. But Bāṇa is very brief in his description as he says that Prabhākaravardhana was "a troubler to the sleep of the Gurjaras". Thus it is clear that the Gurjaras were in possession of some territories. Secondly, Bāṇa refers to them alongwith the Hūṇas, king of Sindhu, lord of

---

JRAS., 1909, *Pp.* 53-76, 247-281; *Bom. Gaz.*, *I*, *Part I*, *Pp.* 471-78; *Jackson*, *JRAS.*, 1905. *Pp.* 153*f*; *Buhler*, *Ind. Ant.*, *XVII*, *P.* 192, *Cambell*, *Bom. Gaz.*, *IX*, *Pt.* 1, 471-78; *Ind. Ant.*, *XL*, *Pp.* 21-24; *Bhandarkar*, *JBBRAS.*, *XXI*, *Pp.* 403*f*. *Proceed. Ind. Hist. Cong.*, *Aligarh Session*, *Pp.* 44*f*; *R. C. Majumdar*. *JDL.*, *X*, *Pp.* 1*f*. *THK.*, *Pp.* 221*f*; *IHQ.*, *Vol. X.*, *Pp.* 337*f.*; *Ibid.*, *XI*, *Pp.* 167*f*. *Ind. Cul.*, *Vol*, *I*, *P.* 510*f*.

3. *Munshi*, *The Glory of the Gurjara Deśa*; *Puri*, *the History of the Gurjara-Pratihāras*, *Bom.*, 1957, *Pp.* 1-6.

4. *Recently Dr. R. C. Majumdar, one of the champions of the foreign descent of the Gurjaras, has also come to realize that "there is not definite evidence that they were foreigners, and came to India in historical times in the wake of the Hūṇas, the Kushanas or other foreign hordes. Their sudden rise into prominence in the sixth century A.D., and the attempt of some of their royal dynasties to fabricate a mythical origin, no doubt, lend colour to this view. But these cannot be relied upon as definite evidence, and we may cite analogous instances of the Kalachuris and the Chandellas."* *CA. P.* 65. *With this remark Dr. Majumdar appears to have inclined to cross the floor and "this question" need not "be left open till more definite evidence is available." For his further views, Munshi Diamond Jub. Vol., Part II, Pp.* 1-18.

5. *CA.*, *P.* 65.

6. *Puri*, *The History of the Gurjara-Pratihāras*, *Bom.*, 57, *Pp.* 1-2.

Lāṭa and Mālvā. This indicates that by the later half of the sixth century A.D. Gurjaras were regarded as an important political force in the comity of kingdoms contemporary to Prabhākaravardhana.

Various names of territories are found to have been associated with Gurjaras and their wide distribution[8] proves the existence of many principalities of the Gurjaras. But most important, and, probably, the first political unit which they carved out for them, was that in Rājputānā. On the basis of Jainad inscription, an information obtained from Tilaka-Mañjarī of Dhanapāla and another inscription of V.S. 682 from Vasantagarh, Dr. Puri has also presumed the association of the Gurjaras with Mount Abu.[9] This association may have been in imitation to other princely families of Paramāras, Pratihāras, Chauhānas and Chālukyas.

Epigraphic evidence also supports the view that the Pratihāras belonged to Rājputānā[10] and this has helped us in constructing the history of the early Gurjara rulers of Rājputānā. The Jodhapur inscription of Bauka[11] and five Ghatiyata inscription of Kakkuka[12] give us a genealogy of the Gurjara dyansty of Rājputānā. The man who is accredited of having laid the foundations of the Gurjara line of Rājputānā is Harichandra. The Jodhapura inscription records the brilliant personal achievements of Harichandra. He had mastered the Vedas and Śāstras and was equal

7. *The first reference to the Gurjaras, according to Dr. Majumdar has been found in a Tamil poem "Manimekhalai" written before the sixth century A.D. But this cannot be taken as an established fact as opined by Mr. Krishnaswamy Aiyangar in a note to Dr. R.C. Majumdar. The former says "I do not offer it as a definite conclusion, but I do believe that the immigration of the Gurjaras is not such a settled fact of history for deductive application." cited by Dr. R. C. Majumdar, in JDL., Vol. X, P.* 3, *fn.* 2.

8. *Puri, Hist. of Gurjara-Pratiharas, Pp.* 14-18

9. *Ibid., P.* 7.

10. *JDL., X, p.* 6*; Ep. Ind., Vol. III, P.* 266.

11. *JRAS.*, 1894, *Pp.* 1*f; Ep. Ind., XVIII, Pp.* 87*f; JDL., Vol. X, Pp.* 6*ff.*

12. *JRAS.*, 1895, *Pp.* 513*f; Ep. Ind., IX, Pp.* 277*f; JDL., X, P.* 6*f.*

to Prajāpati as a preceptor (*Prajāpati samoguruḥ*). He married a Brāhmaṇa's daughter (*Pariṇītā dvijātmajā*) and afterwards he married Bhadrā, a Kṣatriya girl, born in a noble lineage (*dvitiyā Bhadrā Mahākulāguṇānvitā*). The sons through the Brāhmaṇa wife came to be known as Pratihāra Brāhmaṇas (*Pratihāra dvijābhūta Brāhamaṇyām*) and those of the Kṣatriya wife Bhadrā became the Kṣatriya Pratihalras. They are called the drinkers of wine (*madhupāyināḥ*.[13]

This information is further supplemented by Ghatiyata inscriptions which inform us that Harichandra was the family preceptor (*Vaṁśaguru*) of the Pratihāras.

Rajjila was his son by his Kṣatriya wife Bhadrā. He and his three brothers Bhogabhaṭa, Kakka and Dadda conquered the fort of Māṇḍavyapura (mod. Mandor) and thus they started their political achievements.

On the basis of the date of Kakkuka, V.S. 918 (c.A.D. 861), Dr. Majumdar appears to be correct when he says that "the founder of the dynasty, Harichandra, may be placed about 550 A.D."[14] and thus Rajjila, son and successor of Harichandra, and the latter's son Narabhaṭa I and his successor Nāgabhata I were the contemporaries to Prabhākaravardhana.

Here reference may also be made to another line of the Gurjaras who ruled over the Bharoach region. This we learn from the records of Gurjara king, named Dadda II, who claims to have extended his supprt and protection to the Valabhī ruler (Dhruvasena II) when the latter was attacked by Harṣa.[15] His records issued between A.D. 629 and A.D. 641 make him contemporary to Harṣa.

On the basis of Prince of Wales Museum plates of Jayabhaṭṭa (III ?),[16] professor Mirashi has worked out the genealogy of the Gurjaras of Bharoach. Dadda I was the founder of this line. He was succeeded

---

13. *Ep. Ind., Vol. XVIII, Pp.* 87*f., Verses* 6-8.
14. *JDL., X, P.* 8. *also Note* 1.
15. *Ind. Ant., Vol. XVII, P.* 196*f.*
16. *Ep. Ind., Vol. XXIV, Pp.* 178*f.*

by Jayabhaṭṭa I Vītarāga. The latter was succeeded by Dadda II Praśāntrāga. It was during his times Harṣa came into conflict with the Valabhī ruler. Dadda's birth in the Gurjara family and his contemporaneity with Rajjila or his successor Narabhaṭṭa (later half of the sixth century A.D.) support us "reasonably" to conclude that Dadda I and Dadda, one of the sons of Harichandra through his Kṣatriya wife Bhadrā might have been one and the same man[17]. We have references to another Gurjara principality in the Aihole inscription[18] and one that is referred to by Yuan Chwang[19]. It appears probable that, like Rajjila, his other brothers might have carved out their own principalities. This is in tune with the spirit of their record which describes them "as it to bear the burdens of the earth[20]." The role that these Gurjara chiefs played in the political history of the country that followed the decline and fall of Imperial Guptas will be dis- cussed when we discuss Harṣa and his relations with contemporary rulers.

6. *KINGDOM OF VAṄGA AND GAUḌA*

Samudragupta and Chandragupta II achieved the task of annexing and subjugating Samataṭa[1] and Vaṅga[2] and it can definitely be said that

---

17. *This cannot be said conclusively. Dr. Majumdar favours such a view. CA., P.* 66. *Dr. Puri has discussed it in detail and he does not agree with Dr. Majumdar. Hist. of Gujara-Pratihāras, Pp.* 28-30; *but the arguments put forward by the learned scholar are not convincing.*

18. *Ep. Ind., Vol. VI, P.* 1-12.

19. *Watters, II, P.* 249.

20. *CA., Pp.* 65-66.

1. *CII., Vol. III, No.* 1, *Line* 22, *Pp.* 8, 14.

2. *Scholars vary their arguments with regard to the identification of king 'Chandra'. Some identify him with Chandragupta I. CII., Vol. III, No.* 32, *P.* 140, *note* 1; *Basak, Ind. Ant.*, 1919, *Pp.* 98-101; *HNEI., Pp.* 13*ff; JIH., IV, Pp.* 14-22. *Whereas others hold that he was Chandragupta II. JRAS.*, 1897, *Pp.* 1*f. EHI., P.* 290. *Mm. H. P. Sastri identifies him with Chandravarman of Susunia Rock Ins. Ep. Ind., XII, R. C. Majumdar does not take any conclusive stand*

the Gupta empire included entire Bengāl in its territorial boundaries[3]. After the death of Skandagupta and specially under the rulers who followed him in quick succession, Northern India fell prey to gradual political disintegration and as its inevitable result we have seen how a number of small kingdoms were established. Some of them attained tremendous power and declared their independence. Kingdoms of Vaṅga and Samataṭa also tried to make political capital out of these confused and chaotic conditions. As we have seen earlier that, like feudatories and founders of the new principalities, Governors also took full advantage of this political disintegration. A reference has been made to the governor of Puṇḍravardhana who was called simply "Uparika" in the time of Budhagupta. And like the other kingdoms, in Bengāl, too, an independent kingdom was founded after the fall of the Imperial Guptas.

This kingdom of Vaṅga appears to have been founded by Gopachandra[4] who was followed by Dharmāditya and Samāchāradeva. They assumed high-sounding titles of 'Mahārājādhirāja', and probably, the sudden emergence of these mahārājas without proper basis for the justification of these titles, led R. D. Banerjee to come to the conclusion that "these grants are forgeries[5].", but Pargiter takes them as genuine records[6].

---

but he favours the identification of 'Chandra' with Chandragupta II. CA., Pp. 20*f; This appears as correct and several other scholars have supported this view.*

3. *Dr. Majumdar opines that Samataṭa was an exception. Hist. of Bengāl, I,* 1943, *Dacca, P.* 41. *But on the basis of Allahabad Pillar inscription, he, too, feels that "Samataṭa was a tributary state acknowledging the suzerainty of the Gupta Empire." Ibid., P.* 41. *Later he expresses the view that Samataṭa was "gradually incorporated into the Gupta Empire." Ibid., Pp.* 49*f.*

4. *Six inscriptions belonging to these three kings, namely Gopachandra, Dharmāditya and Samāchāradeva of the kingdom of Vaṅga have been discovered so far. Ind., Ant.,* 1910, *Pp.* 193*f; JASB. (N.S.)., VI, Pp.* 429*f; Ibid., VII, Pp.* 476*f; Ep. Ind., XVIII, Pp.* 74*f; Ep. Ind., XXII, P.* 155*f.*

5. *JASB. (N.S.)., Pp.* 429*f; Ibid., VII, Pp.* 289*f; Ibid., X, Pp.* 425*f.*

6. *JASB (N.S.)., VII, Aug.* 1911, *Pp.* 499*f.; JRAS.,* 1912, *Pp.* 710*f.*

Pargiter is further supported by Bhattasali.[7] Dr. Majumdar, who says that gold coins were issued by Samāchāradeva,[8] "supports the same conclusion."[9] This kingdom consisted of Eastern and Southern Bengāl and the Southern part of Western Bengāl[10]. Under these rulers the kingdom of Bengāl enjoyed "strong and stable government" that brought "peace and prosperity to the people"[11]. But their end, like their rise, was also sudden. We learn from the Mahākūṭa pillar inscription that the Chālukya king Kīrtivarman I claims to have achieved the conquest over Aṅga, Vaṅga and Magadha and other kingdoms[12], and, as suggested by Dr. Majumdar, his adversary in Vaṅga must have been "either Samāchāradeva, or one of his successors.[13] This must have shaken the foundations of the Vaṅga kingdom and the new kingdom of Gauḍa might have "dealt the final death blow" to it.[14]

The history of the kingdom of Gauḍa[15] under Śaśāṅka is of much interest during the period under review. The kingdom of Gauḍa consisted of North Bengal and the northern part of West Bengal.[16] As we have

---

7. *Ep. Ind., Vol. XVIII, Pp.* 79*f.*

8. *JASB.* (*N.S.*)., *XIX, Num. Supplement, Pp.* 54*f. cited by R.C. Majumdar in History of Bengāl, I, P.* 52, *note* 1; *Ep. Ind., Vol. XVIII, Pp.* 79-84.

9. *Hist. of Bengāl, I, Pp.* 52*f.*

10. *Ibid., I, Pp.* 51*f.*

11. *Ibid., I, P.* 54.

12. *Ind. Ant., XIX, Pp.* 17 *and* 19; *Bom. Gaz., Vol. I, Part II, P.* 345; *THK., P.* 42.

13. *Majumdar, History of Bengāl, Vol., I., P.* 54.

14. *Ibid., Pp.* 54 *and* 59*f.*

15. *For detailed study of Gauḍa kingdom see IHQ.*, 1952, *Vol.* 28, *Pp.* 123-133.

16. *Dr. Majumdar has discussed the extent of Gauḍa country throughout the ages. Hist. of Bengāl, I, Pp.* 12-15. *He concludes that "throughout the Hindu period Gauḍa and Vaṅga loosely denoted the two prominent political divisions*

seen above that the Imperial Guptas held their sway over entire Bengāl and it was during the political confusion during the decline and after the fall of the Guptas many kingdoms came into existence. The kingdom of Gauḍa under Śaśāṅka was an important one in the eastern part of India.[17] We do not possess any definite information pertaining to an ancestry and early life of Śaśāṅka[18] except the fact that he started his career as a feudatory chief[19], probably under the Maukharis[20]. We do not know anything of

---

of Bengāl, the former comprising the Northern and either the whole or part of Western Bengāl, and the latter, Southern and Eastern Bengāl." *Ibid.*, *P.* 55.

17. *Basak, NHEI., Pp.* 135*f.*

18. *Dr. Raychaudhary establishes his (Śaśāṅka's) connection with the Guptas. PHAI., Sixth Ed., P.* 514; *Dr. R. D. Banerjee opines that he was the son or nephew of Mahāsenagupta. Bāngālār Itihāsa, Part I, Sec. Ed., P.* 105; *cf. Kāmarūpa Śāsanāvali, Introduction, P.* 85. *Dr. Majumdar does not agree with these views. History of Bengal, Vol. I, Pp.* 59-60. *Dr. Sinha also thinks that no relationship can be maintained between Guptas and Śaśāṅka. DKM., P.* 226.

19. *This is clear from Śaśāṅka's own record. CII., Vol., III, No.* 78. *Pp.* 283-284. *On numismatic grounds Bhattasali suggests that Śaśāṅka was son and successor of Mahārājādhirāja Samāchāradeva. Cat. Co. Br. Mus., Intro., P. CXXVII, Pl. XI, cxxiv, Pp.* 149-150. *But this, too, has no proper basis to be accepted. DKM., Pp.* 226*f. notes* 4 *and* 5. *Some attempts are also made to establish "close relationship" between Śaśāṅka and Jayanāga. Ep. Ind., Vol. XVIII, Pp.* 60*f. Dr. Sinha finds some basis in the Harṣacharita where Śaśāṅka or the Gauḍa king is compared to a serpent (HCCTH., Pp.* 83,85). *DKM., P.* 229-234. *But nothing can be settled conclusively till some more positive proofs are available.*

20. *Scholars have differed on this issue as to who was the overlord to whom Śaśāṅka extended his allegiance. Dr. Majumdar holds that he was "no other than Mahāsenagupta." (History of Bengāl, I, P.* 59, *also Pp.* 56*f.*); *but this view does not appear to be well-founded as we learn that Mahāsenagupta, though a very powerful ruler in the earlier part of his reign, had to face many calamities in the later part of his life. Either he was killed in one of the battles or was forced to go into compulsory retirement and his two sons were placed at the court of Prabhākaravardhana.*

the steps Śaśāṅka took to wrest the kingdom of Gauḍa; but it appears that he might have utilized the opportunity of political instablity and confusion that followed the militant expeditions of the Chālukya king Kīrtivarman I. What we know is that Śaśāṅka was the ruler of Gauḍa with his capital at Karṇasuvarṇa. We shall deal with his later activities in course of our discussion about the circumstances that led Harṣa to the thrones of Thāneswar and Kanauj.

7. *KALIṄGA*

It is difficult to say whether Kaliṅga formed the part of the Gupta Empire. It cannot be explained easily why Samudragupta, the Master-builder of the Gupta Empire, during his campaign in the Dakṣiṇāpatha, did not follow "the more practicable route to the Godāvarī-Kriṣṇā Doab along the eastern coast through Southern-Western Bengal" and took up "the extremely difficult route through the Jabalpur and Raipur districts of the Central Provinces (Madhya Pradesh)."[1] His itinerary, probably, covered of Bamra, Rairakhol, Sonepur, Patna and Karond,[2] and he

---

Thus the overlordship of Mahāsenagupta over Śaśāṅka cannot be maintained for entire period of his rule. On the other hand, Dr. Ganguly, on the authority of the Deo-Baranark inscription, maintains that "Śaśāṅka was a feudatory of Avantivarman and probably, for a short period, of his son Grahavarman." IHQ., Pp. 456f. I have also submitted elsewhere, as has been suggested by Dr. Majumdar, that Mahāsenagupta conquered Magadha. To me it appears that Śaśāṅka was a feudatory to Mahāsenagupta during the latter's earlier years when he held sway over Magadha and probably over part of Assam; but after his fall, came under the Maukharīs, and, therefore, Śaśāṅka musthave accepted the suzerainty of the Maukharīs. Thus the possibility is that Śaśāṅka became the feudatory of Avantivarman and, later, of his son Grahavarman, as has been suggested by Dr. Ganguly. Dr. Majumdar, too, says that it is "not altogether improbable" but "not supported by any convincing evidence." I may humbly submit that Dr. Majumdar's arguments, too, are hardly convincing.

1. *R. D. Banerjee, History of Orissa, Cal.*, 1930, *Vol. I, P.* 115.
2. *Ibid., P.* 115.

"proceeded or receded leaving the country unchanged[3]." We have also no information at present to show that Orissa was conquered by any of the successors of Samudragupta. At the same time we do not come accross any "royal dynasty ruling over Orissa during the fourth and fifth centuries A.D[4]..

But the province was "distinctly within the zone of influence of Gupta political influence and culture"[5] and remained so throughout the Gupta period. This is proved by an inscription discovered at Sumaṇḍala, a village near Khallikote in Orissa[6].

PṚITHVĪ-VIGRAHA

This Sumaṇḍala inscription is of great importance as it gives an account of a king named Pṛithvī-Vigraha who is said to have ruled over Kaliṅga "in the dominion of the Guptas", in the year 205 of the G.E. corresponding to c. 569-70 A.D.. Thus, Orissa appears to have been under Gupta suzerainty, at least, till c. A.D. 569-70[7]. This expansion of Gupta influence is also proved by the use of the Gupta era in certain inscriptions.[8] We know nothing of the Gupta supremacy in Kaliṅga after the year 569-70 A.D.; neither we possess any information about the successors of Pṛithvī-Vigraha. He was probably the first and the last man in his family to attain a feudatory status worth the name and with the end of his life the family also lost its importance in the political scene in Kaliṅga.

MĀNAVAṀŚA

After the decline of the Guptas and with that of the line of Pṛithvī-Vigraha we come to the new line of the Māna rulers. The earliest dated record that makes references to Māna dynasty is the Patiakella plate of

3. *Ibid., P.* 117.
4. *CA., P.* 92.
5. *R. D. Banerjee, History of Orissa, Vol. I, P.* 117.; *C.A., P.* 92.
6. *IHQ., Vol. XXVI, Pp.* 75.
7. *CA., Pp.* 44, 92-93.
8. *R. D. Banerjee, History of Orissa, Vol. I, P.* 117. *The learned*

the Mahārāja Śivarāja. This is dated in the year G.E. 283 (c.A.D. 602-3)[9].

ŚAGGUYAYYANA

This record shows that Mahārāja Śivarāja was a feudatory to king Śagguyayyana,[10] who belonged to the Mānavaṁśa. It is really surprising to note that the feudatory ruler Śivarāja assumed the title of Mahārāja whereas Śagguyayyana did not assume any title such as Mahārāja or Mahārājādhirāja. He is simply referred to as Paramamāheśvara-Paramabhaṭṭāraka Paramadevatādhidaivatā. That the feudatory assumed the title of Mahārāja suggests that the suzerain certainly must have been enjoying higher political status, and an absence of any political title such as Mahārāja or Mahārājādhirāja in his case might have been accidental or an error on the part of the engraver of the grant.

As his earliest known date is the year G.E. 260 (c. 579-80 A.D.)[11], it appears that Śugguyayyana was the first man in the Mānavaṁśa who brought eminence to his line. It is probable that the family of Pṛithvī-Vigraha might have been uprooted by Śagguyayyana sometime after G.E. 250 (c. 569-70 A.D.), but certainly before G.E. 260[12] (c. 579-80 A.D.), the first known date of his reign.

---

scholar has referred to the Patiakella plate of Śivarāja of the Gupta year 283 *and the Arang Plate of Bhīmasena II of the Gupta year* 282. *Ep. Ind., Vol. IX, Pp.* 342-345.

9. *Ep. Ind., Vol. IX, Pp.* 285-88. *Another record of this ruler is also found. Ibid., Vol. XXIII, Pp.* 198*f.*

10. *Dr. Stein konow reads it as 'Saṁbhuyayya' (referred to in Hist. of Orissa, Vol. I, P.* 118) *and it is adopted by certain authors (CA., P.* 93)*; but Dr. Banerjee reads it as 'Śagguyayyana' and observes that after Steins's suggested reading "I cannot change my opinion framed twentyfour years ago after seeing the plate once more." Hist. of Orissa, Vol. I, P.* 118.

11. *Ep. Ind., Vol. XXIII, P.* 198.

12. *JRASB. (Letters), Vol. XI, Pp.* 4*f.*

ORIGIN OF THE MĀNAS

Our knowledge of the origin of the Māna dynasty is insufficient and poor. Dr. R. D. Banerjee tries to connect this line to another Māna line[13] which is referred to in the Govindapur Stone inscription of the poet Gaṅgādhara of the Śaka year 1059[14] and the Dūdhapāni rock inscription of Udayamāna[15]. These inscriptions record the modest beginning of the dynasty that ultimately succeeded in carving out a small principality under Udayamāna, and this was made possible with an assistance of King Ādisiṁha of Magadha.

THE ŚAILODBHAVAS

But we know nothing definite about "many generations" that ruled after Śagguyayyana and soon find another dynasty ruling over Orissa simultaneously. This was the family of Śailodbhavas[16] known from the Buguda plates of Mādhavavarman discovered at Buguda in Ghumsur Tālukā of the Ganjām District.[17]

THEIR ORIGIN

This inscription and several other records of the later period inform that Pulindasena, a great devotee of Brahman, got a boon from Brahman. He created, out of Śilā, the lord Śailodbhava. The latter founded the line of Śailodbhavas.[18] It was in this family Raṇabhīta or Araṇabhīta was born, who, it appears, "took advantage of the anarchy

---

13. *History of Orissa, Vol. I, Pp.* 118-19.

14. *Ep. Ind., Vol. II, Pp.* 330-342.

15. *Ibid., Vol. II, P.* 334-347.

16. *The dynasty has been dealt with in details in the Journal of Andhra Historical Research Society. Vol. X, Pp.* 1*f; R. D. Banerjee, Hist. of Orissa, Pp.* 120*f.*

17. *Ep. Ind., Vol. III, Pp.* 41-46; *Ibid., Vol. VI, Pp.* 143-6; *Ibid., Vol. VII, Pp.* 100-101.

18. *As the line founded by Puṣpabhūti was called Puṣpabhūtivaṁśa, Śailodbhavas were named after Śilā.*

and confusion, following the dissolution of the Gupta Empire," carved out an independent kingdom of his own.[19]

SAINYABHĪṬA I, YAŚOBHĪṬA AND SAINYABHĪṬA II

Raṇabhīṭa or Araṇabhīṭa was succeeded by his son Sainyabhīṭa I Mādhavarāja. The latter was succeeded by his son Yaśobhīṭa. His son was Śainyabhīṭa II Mādhavarāja II. The latter, according to his Ganjām plates of the G.E. 300 (c.A.D. 619) flourished in the second decade of the 7th century A.D. or even earlier. He assumed the title of Mahāsāmanta and Mahārāja and was a feudatory of Mahārājādhirāja Śaśāṅka.

If we assign a period of twenty years to each generation preceding to Sainyabhīṭa II Mādhavarāja II, we can assume that Raṇabhīṭa might have flourished about the middle of the sixth century A.D..

8. *KĀMARŪPA*[1]

Samudragupta was the first of the Gupta emperors to have extended his suzerainty over Assam.[2] The Allahabad Pillar inscription refers to the kingdoms of Davāka[3] and Kāmarūpa.[4] These kingdoms are said to

---

19. *CA., P.* 94.

1. *The kingdom was also known as Prāgjyotiṣa, the name sometimes applied to the capital also. It was during the classical, or, rather the medieval times, the kingdom came to be known as Kāmarūpa. About the* 13*th century it was named Assam.*

2. *CII., Vol. III, No.* 1, *Pp.* 16*f; RKMGE., Pp.* 24*f; AIC., P.* 20.*; CA., Pp.* 8*f; PHAI., Sixth Ed., P.* 543, *footnote* 4.

3. *Kingdom of Davāka has not yet been "satisfactorily identified". (PHAI., Sixth Ed., P.* 643, *footnote* 4). *It has been identified with Dacca, (Hoyland, the Empire of the Great Mogol, P.* 14*; AIG., P.* 20) *an ancient kingdom of Tagaung in upper Burma. (Ibid., P.* 20), *Kopili-Yamuna-Kolong Valley in Middle Assam. (K. L. Barua, Early History of Kāmarūpa P.* 42)*; RKMGE., P.* 24*; CR., Pp.* 8*f; Ep. Ind., Vol. XXVII, Pp.* 18*f.*

4. *Kāmarūpa certainly formed the part of Assam. It may correspond*

have been conquered by Samudragupta. At that time Kāmarūpa was ruled over by the Varmans.

ORIGIN OF THE VARMANS

The Nidhānapur copper plate of Bhāskaravarman[5] and the Nālandā seals[6] show that Puṣyavarman was the first ruler in the line of the Varmans.

Bāṇa records that the progenitor of the line of the Varmans of Kāmarūpa was Naraka, "son of the Holy Earth having through union with lord Viṣṇu in his Boar incarnation." He adds, "In the posterity of this hero many great kings were born." Of them he makes mention of Bhāgadatta, Puṣpadatta and Vajradatta and jumps to Mahārājādhirāja Suṣthitavarman, greatgrandson of Mahārāja Bhūtivarman, grandson of Chandramukhavarman and son of Sthitavarman. To him was born by his queen Śyāmādevī, a son and heir, Bhāskaradyuti, otherwise named Bhāskaravarman.[7] He was contemporary to Harṣa.

Thus, it appears that Naraka was treated as the founder of the line of the Varmans according to tradition recorded by Bāṇa; but Puṣyavarman appears to be the first historical personage who might have started his career about the middle of the fourth century A.D.,[8] and it has been suggested that "the dynasty owed its rise or importance to the patronage of the great emperor (*Samudragupta*)."[9]

It has been further suggested that the similarity of names of Samudragupta and his wife Datta Devi with the second king Samudravarman of the Varman dynasty of Kāmarūpa and his queen Datta Devi was not "a mere coincidence" but rather "deliberate imitations of the names of the

---

to Lower Assam, (PHAI., Sixth Ed., P. 543) *consisting of Gauhātī District. RKMGE. P.* 24.

5. *Ep. Ind., Vol. XII, Pp.* 73*f.; Ibid., Vol. XIX, Pp.* 115*f.*
6. *Mem. Arch. Su. of India., No.* 66, *Pp.* 69-70.
7. *HCCTH., P.* 217.
8. *CA., P.* 89.
9. *Ibid., P.* 89.

Gupta emperor and his queen", or Puṣyavarman, "out of loyalty and devotion to his overlord and patron named his son and daughter-in-law after the names of the great emperor and empress."[10]

The Imperial Guptas continued their hold over Assam and, therefore, we cannot attach much political significance to the early rulers of the Varman dynasty till we come to the beginning of the sixth century A.D.. They appear to have enjoyed feudatory status under the Guptas.

But with the weakening of the Gupta power they might have made some attempts to throw off their traditional allegiance which they extended to the Guptas. This accounts for the performances of two aśvamedhas by Nārāyaṇavarman or his predecessors.[11] When the Gupta Empire broke into pieces, the Varmans got an opportunity of establishing their independent rule over the Brahmaputrā Valley.

BHŪTIVARMAN

Under Bhūtivarman (Mahābhūtivarman) the Varmans extended their territorial boundaries up to Kośī. This is confirmed by his land grants in Viṣaya Chandrapurī, demarcated by Kauśikī (Kosī).[12]

We have already seen that the sixth century starts with political anarchy and confusion, and almost all over India attempts were made for carving out independent principalities. The Varmans, who were so far the loyal feudatories to the Guptas, made successful bid of establishing an independent rule. Bhūtivarman's conquests enabled him to extend his kingdom up to the Surmā valley corresponding to Sylhet Division and he made grants to Brāhmaṇas. We learn from the Nidhānapur Copper-plates of Bhāskaravarman that the grants were already made by Bhūtivarman to more than two hundred Brāhmaṇas. Bhāskaravarman ratified

---

10. *Ibid. P.* 90.

11. *Mem. Arch. Sur. Ind. No.* 66., *Pp.* 69*f.*; *JBROS., Vol. V, Pp.* 302*f*; *Ibid., VI, Pp.* 151*f.*

12. *Ep. Ind., Vol. XII, Pp.* 65*f*; *Ibid., Vol. XIX, Pp.* 115*f.*

these grants as the original deed was lost. These lands were located in the sylhet region.[13]

It was, probably to commemorate these victories he performed the aśvamedha sacrifice[14] and thus, justifiably assumed the title of Mahārājādhirāja.[15]

That Bhūtivarman was the first ruler of his dynasty who succeeded in his attempts at establishing an independent kingdom is also proved by Bāṇa. The latter records the tradition current in sixth-seventh centuries A.D. and says that after Bhāgadatta, Puṣpadatta, and Vajradatta had passed away, there was born Mahārājādhirāja Suṣthiravarman, great-grandson of Mahārāja Bhūtivarman.[16] Thus both epigraphic and literary traditions make Bhūtivarman the real founder of political power of the Varmans of Kāmarūpa.

He, as told earlier, made real political gains out of the political conditions following the disintegration of the Gupta empire.

CHANDRAMUKHAVARMAN

Bhūtivarman was succeeded by Chandramukhavarman. We know very little about him. Bāṇa does not ascribe to him any title, such as Mahārājādhirāja or Mahārāja, and it appears that he did not add any territory to the existing one, but might have maintained the ancestral kingdom intact.

STHITAVARMAN

Chandramukhavarman was succeeded by Sthitavarman. About his political achievements, too, we do not find any categorical reference.

---

13. *CA., P.* 91, *footnote* 2; *JRASBL., Vol. I, Pp.* 419*f; Ind. Cul., Vol. II, Pp.* 153*f.; IHQ., Vol. VII, Pp.* 743*f; Ibid., Vol. XI, Pp.* 60*f.; Ep. Ind., Vol. XIX., Pp.* 11*f.*

14. *This information is based upon an information we get from a rock inscription in the Kapili valley. Ep. Ind., Vol. XXVII, Pp.* 18*f.*

15. *Ibid., Pp.* 18*f.*

16. *HCCTH., P.* 217.

But his performances of two Aśvamedha sacrifices must have some basis. He might have pursued the policy of his grandfather and it is, probably, to commemorate some political gains or conquests he might have performed these Aśvamedha sacrifices.

SUṢTHITAVARMAN

Sthitavarman was succeeded by Suṣthitavarman. Bāṇa calls him Mahārājādhirāja and a splendid hero famous in the world as Mṛigāṅka.[17] Thus after Bhūtivarman he was the next great king of the dynasty, and perhaps greater than Bhūtivarman, if Bāṇa's titles of 'Mahārāja' and 'Mahārājādhirāja' to Bhūtivarman and Suṣthitavarman respectively, bear some political significance.

But, as told earlier, he suffered a major defeat at the hands of Mahāsenagupta. This would have been a great setback to the rising power of the Varmans of Kāmarūpa; but, as Dr. Majumdar opines that it led to no permanent result and they (*the Varmans*) might have recovered soon as we learn that soon after his campaign in Brahmaputrā Valley, Mahāsenagupta fell prey to successive reverses.

Thus Suṣthitavarman's defeat at the hands of Mahāsenagupta might have been a temporary eclipse over the rising power of the Varmans and the latter soon recovered from this shock. Bāṇa treats him with high estimation. He (*Suṣthitavarman*) even as a boy (*Yaśchabālaeva*) dealt out presents to Brāhmaṇas (*dvijātīnaprityāchārātina*) through affection (*prītyā*) and reverses to all enemies through hate (*Samagrānpratigrahānagrāhayat*). He took away the conch-shells of the lords of the armies (*Vāhinīnāthānāṁ*);[18] grasped the stability of the earth (*pṛithivyāḥ-sthaivya jagrrāḥ*); seized the majesty of monarchs (*avanībhṛitāṁ*).[19]

These praises are certainly exaggerated; but we can hardly

---

17. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 217.

18. *The learned editors maintain that "the use of the conches was a sign of independent rule."* *HCCTH.*, *P.* 217, *footnote* 2.

19. *Ibid.*, *P.* 217.

dismiss them as entirely baseless. What Bāṇa makes clear is that Susthitavarman was the first great king who enjoyed complete independent status.

SUPRATIṢṬHITAVARMAN AND BHĀSKARAVARMAN

Bāṇa tells us that Susthitavarman was succeeded by Bhāskaravarman. The latter is said to be his son and heir by his queen Śyāmādevī. He was born to her as Bhīsma was born to Śāntanu by Bhāgīrathī.[20] This clearly makes out a case for Bhāskaravarman as an immediate successor of Susthitavarman. But Doobi Copper-plate of Bhāskaravarman[21] gives us another name of prince Supratiṣṭhitavarman, who succeeded Susthitavarman and preceded Bhāskaravarman. This record "proves definitely" that Supratiṣṭhitavarman ascended the throne.[22] But we cannot explain why he is dropped by Bāṇa in his account in the Harṣacharita. It is probable that he might have ruled for a very short time and might not have caught the attention of Bāṇa. Doobi copper-plate of Bhāskaravarman records that Supratiṣṭhitavarman and Bhāskaravarman "defeated the forces of Gauḍa after the death of their father while they were still young."[23] The suggestion of Dr. R. C. Majumdar that "victory over the forces of Gauḍa must have taken place almost immediately after the victorious campaign of Mahāsenagupta" and that "the defeated Gauḍa king was none other than Mahāsenagupta"[24] is a workable hypothesis. But as the learned scholar has observed, it is impossible to come to any definite conclusion.[25]

Supratiṣṭhitavarman was succeeded by his brother Bhāskaravarman. Bāṇa says it was his firm resolution (Saṁkalpa) never to pay homage to any being (*nāhanmanyaṁ namaskuryāmiti*) except the lotus

---

20. *Ibid., P.* 217.
21. *JARS., Vol. XII, Nos.* 1 *and* 2, *P.* 16.
22. *CA., P.* 92, *footnote* 2.
23. *JRAS., Vol. XII, Nos.* 1 *and* 2; *CA., P.* 92.
24. *Ibid., Pp.* 76 *and* 92.
25. *Ibid., P.* 76.

feet of lord Sthāṇu.[26] He was contemporary of Harṣa and his role in the national political scene will be discussed alongwith Harṣa's political career.

26. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 217. हृ० च०, स० उ०, प्र० ६३। *Yaśodharman's head is also said to have never been brought into the humility of obeisance to any other save Sthāṇu. CII, Vol. III. No.* 33, *P.* 147., *Line* 6. (स्थाणोरन्यत्र येत प्रणति), *Hist. and Lit. Ins.*, *P.* 137.

CHAPTER II

FAMILY AND HERITAGE OF HARṢA

THE LAND OF SHRĪKAṆṬHA JANAPADA AND THĀNEŚVARA

POSITION AND IMPORTANCE

The small township of Thāneśvara (*Sthāneśvara or Sthāṇīśvara or Sthāṇviśvara*)[1] in Ambālā District of Punjāb along with its adjoining territories is of very high antiquity. It is associated with India's political, cultural and religious history since the very dawn of our civilization. The town, at one time, was one of the most glorious political and cultural centres of this country.[2]

---

1. *Identification of Thāneśara or Thāneśvara with Sthāneśvara or Sthāṇīśvara or Sthāṇviśvara is almost certain. ASIRC., Vol. II, P.* 212. *This, however, has been suspected by Watters. Vol. I, Pp.* 316-17. *He says that "there is no correspondence in distance, direction or measurement" of these two places. According to Alberuni "Thāneśvara is about* 180 *miles north-north-west of Mathurā". Alberuni, Vol. I, p.* 199. *And according to the Chinese pilgrim Sthāneśvara was about* 100 *miles to the North-East of Mathurā. Watters, I, P.* 316. *Watters further remarks that the pilgrim had not journeyed to the south of Thāneśvara, he would probably have told us of the celebrated tank in the district about which Alberuni and Tavernier relate wonderful things." Watters, I, Pp.* 416-17; *Alberuni, Vol. II, P.* 145; *Berniers' Travels, P.* 302. *This lack of correspondence in distance and direction, as pointed out by Watters, may be due to the different routes taken by Yuan Chwang and Alberuni.*

2. *Sī-yū-ki refers to it, "This is one of the oldest and most celebrated places in India on account of its connections with Pāṇḍus." Beal, I, P.* 183; *Watters, Vol. I, Pp.* 314-317; *Ambālā Distt. Gazetteer, Pp.* 14-16, *ASIRC., Vol. I, P.* 245; *Ibid., Vol. II, Pp.* 212*f.*; *Ibid., Vol. XIV, Pp.* 72-106; *HCCTH., Pp.* 79-84; *HC., Kane's Ed., Canto* 3, *Pp.* 42-43.

THĀNEŚVARA

The name of Thāneśavra or Sthāṇeśvara or Sthāṇvīśvara or Sthāṇīśvara is said to be derived either from the 'Sthāṇu' or 'abode' of 'Īśvara' or 'Mahādeva' or from the junction of his names of 'Sthāṇu' and 'Īśvara'.[3] Though it is one of the most important centres of culture, philosophy and religion, it is surprising to note that a reference to Sthāṇvīśvara as a town does not go back prior to the Harṣacharita of Bāṇa. Bāṇa speaks of Sthāṇvīśvara in a very magniloquent style,[4] as we shall see later. The earliest foreign reference to this town is probably by Ptolemy who refers to it as 'Batan-Kaisara' which may correspond to 'Satan-aisara' or 'Sthāneśara.'[5] Chinese pilgrim, Yuan Chwang, also refers to it as Sa-ta-ni-ssŭ-fa-lo.[6]

---

3. *ASIRC., Vol. II, P.* 212. *The word "Sthāṇu" stands for "stationary", "firm", "fixed," "immovable" or "motionless" and it is also the name of "Śiva" who is supposed to remain as motionless as the trunk of a tree during his austerities. It has been used in this sense in the Kāvya literature. In the Mahābhārata and Harivaṁsapurāṇa he is one of the eleven Rudras. Mahābhārata (Śalya, Chap.* 54; *Vana, Chap,* 83) *also refers to a Sthāṇutīrtha known as 'Sthāṇuvata.' There is also a Sanskrit work known as Sthāṇvāśrama-Mahātmya. In Vāmanapurāṇa Sthāṇvīśvara, is also mentioned as a name of Liṅgaṁ of Śiva and it was at Sthāṇvīśvara that the liṅga worship was first established, Monierwilliams. Pp.* 1262-3; *Geographical dictionary of Ancient and Medieval India by Nundo Lal Dey, Sec. Ed., Luzac and Co., Lon.,* 1927, *P.* 194. *Bāṇa also calls it "Sthaṇvīśvara" HCCTH, P.* 81; *HC., Kane's Ed., Canto* 3, *P.* 43.

4. *HCCTH., Pp.* 79-83.

5. *ASIRC., Vol. II, Pp.* 212-13; *But Saint Martin has identified 'Ostobalasara' (Stobolasara) with Sthāṇvīśvara. McCrindle's Ancient India as Described by Ptolemy, Ed. Surendra Nath Majumdar, Cal.,* 1927, *P.* 128.

6. *Watters, I, P.* 314. *According to Yuan Chwang the name applies both to the region and its capital. "The country", according to him, "was* 7,000 *li in circuit and its capital with the same name, apparently, was above* 20 *li in circuit." Ibid., P.* 314. *Bāṇa confirms this statement of the pilgrim. After describing the riches, glory and culture of Śrīkaṇṭha country he comes to Sthāṇeśvara and says*

Before it acquired eminence under the Puṣpabhūtis, Thāneśvara and the area immediately surrounding it, between the Sarasvatī and the Dhṛiṣḍavatī rivers, was known as Kurukṣetra, one of the most sacred and holy lands.[7] Pāṇini refers to the Kurus, both as a Janapada and a kingdom[8] with its capital at Hastināpura.[9] In the Kāśikā reference is made to the Kururāṣṭra, Kuru-jāṅgala and Kurukṣetra as three district geographical areas.[10] It has been suggested that Kuru-rāṣṭra lay in the Gaṅgā Jamunā Doab and had its capital at Hastināpura.[11] Kurujāṅgala consisted of what are now known as the districts Rohtak, Hansi and Hissār. And Kurukṣetra included within its boundaries the modern Kaithal and Karnal.[12] The traditional boundaries of Kurukṣetra, as indicated above, were the rivers Sarasvatī and Dhṛiṣḍvati.[13] The Buddhist[14] and Jain[15] works refer to it as one of the sixteen great countries (*Ṣoḍaṣmahājanapadas*). This region enjoyed a status as a place of great importance in India's political, social and cultural heritage. Throughout the ages people flocked to this land from far and wide because of its rich culture and religious

---

"*In such a country* (*Śrīkaṇṭha*) *is a certain district* (*Janapada*) *called Śthāṇviśvara.* 'स्थाण्वीश्वराख्यो जनपदविशेषः' ह० च०, तृ० उ०, पृ० ४३; *HCCTH.*, *P.* 81.

7. *Matsyapurāṇa*, 106.57; *Kūrmapurāṇa*, 1.37. *Mahābhārata*, (*Vana*, *Ch.* 83, *Verse* 4.) *tells us that people who live in Kurukṣetra* (*vasanti*) *to the south of Sarasvati* (*Dakṣiṇena sarasvatyā and north cf Dhṛiṣḍvatī* (*Dhrishḍvatyottareṇa*), *live in paradise. cf. Padmapurāṇa, Uttara khaṇḍa*, 35-38.; *Kūrmapurāṇa*, *Pūrvabhāga*, 30-45-48.

8. *Aṣṭādhyāyī*, *IV.* 1.172.

9. *Ibid.*, *VI*, 2.201.

10. *Kāśikā*, *II.* 47.

11. *Hastināpura is identified with a ruined site in Meeruth District on the old bank of Gaṅgā. Later the capital was Indraprastha, identified with modern Indarapat near Delhi. Cambridge History of India, Vol. I*, *P.* 308.

12. *Agarwal, India As known to Pāṇini, Lucknow*, 1952, *Pp.* 54-55.

13. *Mahābhārata*, *Vana Pa.* 83.4.

14. *Aṅguttaranikāya*, *I.* 213; *IV.* 252*f.*

15. *Uttarādhyāyana Sūtra.* (*Sacred Books of the East, Vol. XLV*), *P.* 62.

sanctity.[16] Kurukṣetra is generally associated with what is good and great in India's life and culture. Writing about Śrīkaṇṭha Janapada Bāṇa informs us that the region was named after a nāga, named Śrīkaṇṭha.[17] He depicts a graphic, vivid and unintermitteut picture of the prosperity, rich culture and glorious heritage of the Śrīkaṇṭha Janapada of which Sthāṇvīśvara was capital.[18] It is in great magniloquence that he tells us that the coutry was "inhabited by good people" (*puṇyakṛtāmadhivāso*) where "the laws and code of conduct are for ever liberalized"[19] (*satatamasaṁkīrṇa-varṇavyavahārasthitiḥ*) and where "the order of the kṛita age (*Kṛitayuga-vyavasthāḥ*) prevails."[20] On every side "its marches are packed with corn heaps" (*khaladhānadhāmbhirvibhajyamānaiḥ sasyakūṭaiḥ*) Throughout "it is adorned with rice crops extending beyond their fields" (*urvarāvarīyobhiḥ śāleyairalaṅkṛtaḥ*). "Upon its lordly uplands are wheat crops variegated with Rājamāṣa patches ripe to bursting" (*pākaviśarārurāja-māsanikarakirmīritaischa*). It was the land where "milk and fruits were available in plenty."[21]

---

16. *Dr. B. C. Law, Belvalkar Felicitation Volume, Pp.* 249*ff.*

17. *HCCTH., P.* 94. कालेन श्वेत्राधिपतिरस्य मन्नान्मैव लब्धव्यपदेशस्य देशस्य नागतस्ते श्रोतोपकण्ठं श्रीकण्ठनामा, ह० च०, तृ० उच्छ०, पृ० ५२।

18. हर्ष चरित, उ० ३, पृ० ४२-३। *HCCTH., Pp.* 79-83. *Bāṇa does not make his ideas clear about territorial jurisdiction of Śrīkaṇṭha and Sthāṇvīśvara. Former is called Janapada whereas the latter is called Janapada proper (Janapadaviśeṣaḥ). From the description of Bāṇa it appears that Śrīkaṇṭha was the country with its capital at Sthāṇvīśvara. But Yuan Chwang informs us that the country and its capital were known by one and the same Sthāṇeśvara (Sa-t' a-ni-ssu-fa-lo). Watters, I, P.* 314.

19. *Cowell and Thomas use word 'unconfused' for "asaṁkīrna". I prefer to adopt '"liberalized" for it.*

20. *HCCTH., P.* 79; *HCK., P.* 42.

21. *HCCGH., Pp.* 79-80; *HCK., P.* 42. *Bāṇa is supported by Yuan Chwang. The latter says that "the soil was rich and fertile and the crops were abundant." Watters, I, P.* 314; *HCCTH., Pp.* 81-82. *HCK., P.* 43. *Yuan Chwang says that "the rich families vied with each other in extravagance. The*

Like the country its capital also gets the rich treatment from Bāṇa's liberal pen. He says that "it was like an encampment of the kṛita age" (*Śibirasannive'sa iva kṛatayugasya*), "like the Brahmaloka's first descent (*prathamo-avatāra iva Brahmalokasya*)). "It was famous for the meditation of Brahmaṛishis seated on the padmāsana." Its "houses were plastered with ambrosia and were built in rows." For "its riches it was like Kubera's city oppressing the world with clinking ornaments of wine-flushed beauties" (*madhumattamattakāśinībhūṣaṇaravabharitabhuvano*).[22]

He tells us further about the varied culture of the country. It was made "the hermitage (*tapovanaṁ*) by the sage (*munibhiḥ*), pleasure retreat (*Kāmāyatana*) by the courtesans (*Veśyabhiḥ*), Saṅgītasālā by the actors (*lāsakaiḥ*), city of death (*yamanagaraṁ*) for the foes (*śatrubhiḥ*), land of philosopher's stone (*chintāmaṇibhūmiḥ*) for seekers of wealth (*ityarthibhiḥ*), land of heroes (*vīrakṣetra*) for warriors (*śastropajīvibhiḥ*) preceptor's home (*gurukulamiti*) for aspirants to knowledge (*vidyārthibhiḥ*), Gandharva's city for singers (*gayanaiḥ*) temple of Viśvakarmā for scientists (*vijñānibhiḥ*), for merchants (*Vaidehakaiḥ*) the land of profit (*lābhabhūmiḥ*), for bards (*bandibhiḥ*) the gambling house (*dyūtasthānaṁ*), assembly of virtuous (*sādhusamāgama*) for good men (*sadbhiḥ*), the cage of vajra (*vajrapañjaraṁ*) for refugees (*śarṇāgataiḥ*), free gathering (*viṭagoṣṭhi*)

---

people were greatly devoted to magical arts and highly prized outlandish accomplishments....rarities from other lands were collected in this country." *Watters, I,* P. 314.

22. *HCCTH., Pp.* 80-81.

23. *Pāṇini calls some of his saṁghas as 'Āyudhajīvināḥ' where as Kauṭilya designates, them as "Śastropajīvinaḥ." It has been rightly suggested that 'Śastropajīvinaḥ' 'observed the practice of arms or military art.' Jayaswal, Hindu Polity, Bangalore, 3rd. Ed.,* 1955, *P.* 31. *It is in that sense Bāṇa uses the term. Manu says that warriors from Kurukṣetra, Matsya, Pāñchāla and Śāurasena should be placed in front line of the battle.*

"कुरुक्षेत्रांश्च मत्स्यांश्च पंचालान्शूरसेन जान।
'दीर्घाल्लघ्वंश्चैव नरानग्रानीकेषु योजयेत् ॥ मनु० स्मृ०, ७, ११३।

for libertines,[24] "the reward of their good deeds" (*sukṛitapariṇāma*) "for the way farers" (*pathikaiḥ*), "the mine (*asuravivaraṁ*) for treasure seekers (*vātikaiḥ*), Buddhist monastery (*Śākyāśramaṁ*) for quietists (*śamibhiḥ*), Apsarās' city (*Apsarāḥpuraṁ*) for lovers (*kāmibhiḥ*), festive gathering (*mahotsavasamāja* for troubadours (*chāraṇaiḥ*) and stream of wealth (*vasudhā*) for the Brāhmaṇas."[25]

THE KING PUṢPABHŪTI

Bāṇa tells us that "in that country there arose a monarch named Puṣpabhūti." He gives a fabulous account of this king. He was "like Indra incarnate" (*sākṣāt Sahasrāṣa iva*), "a bow supporting all varṇa" (*sarvavarṇadharaṁ dhanurdhānaḥ*), "Meru-like in attribute of a golden nature" (*kalyāṇaprakṛititve*), "mandard-like in attracting glory or Lakṣmī" (*mandaramaya iva Lakṣmī saṁakarṣaṇe*), "ocean-like in observing proper bounds" (*jalanidhimaya iva maryādyāṁ*), "ether-like in the noising abroad of his fame or manifesting sound" (*ākāśamaya iva śabdaprādurbhāve*) "moon-like in his receptivity for arts" (*śaśimaya iva kalāsaṁgrahe*) "Veda-like in truthful speech" (*vedamaya ivā kṛitimalapatve*) "earth-like in supporting all mankind" (*dharaṇīmaya iva lokadhṛitikaraṇe*) "wind-like in sweeping away the bad passions of all kings (or earthly dvst) (*pavanamaya iva sarvapārthivarajorikāraharaṇe*), "a Guru in speech" (*Gururvachasi*), "a Pṛithu in breast" (*Pṛithururasi*) "a Viśāla[26] in intellect" (*Viśālomanasi*), "a Janaka in asceticism" (*Janakastapasi*), "a Suyātra in splendour" (*Suyātrastejasi*), "a Sumantra in secret council" (*Sumantro rahasi*), "a Buddha in station" (*Budhaḥ sadasi*), "an Arjuna in brilliance"

---

24. *Cowell and Thomas translate 'viṭagoṣṭhī' as "Rogues' meet." 'Viṭa' means 'a voluptuary', 'a sensualist'.... accomplished in the arts of poetry, music etc.; also 'the keeper of the prostitutes.' As it is accompanied by goṣṭhī, it may correspond to a gathering of artists. 'Vidagdha', then, may mean a learned puṇḍit. If viṭagoṣṭhī is taken for a gathering of pimps, the vidāgdha may naturally mean a libertine. As Bāṇa's accounts are full of puns, we cannot make out any clear meaning conclusively.*

25. *HCCTH.*, P. 82; *HCK.*, *Pp.* 43-44.

26. *Name of Bodhisattva. HCCTH.*, P. 84, *Footnote* 8.

(*Arjuno Yaśasi*)", a Bhīṣma with a bow" (*Bhīṣmó dhanuṣi*), "a Niṣādha, in frame" (*Niṣādho vapuṣi*), "a Śatrughna in battle" (*Śatrughnaḥ samare*) "a Śūra in vanquishing the armies of heroes,"[27] and "a Dakṣa in fecundity" (*Dakṣaḥ prajākarmaṇi*). Unfatigued with his description of Puṣpabhūti's grandeur and greatness as cited above, Bāṇa concludes that "he (*Puṣpabhūti*) was framed in fine as it seemed of the compounded splendour of the primaeval kings."[28]

HIS POLITICAL ACHIEVEMENTS

We cannot come to any definite conclusion pertaining to the political achievements of Puṣpabhūti on the basis of Bāṇa's above account. We have to accept Bāṇa's description with reservations. We know that he is accustomed to indulge in exaggerations. But some of the analogies put forward by Bāṇa appear to be meaningful.

Puṣpabhūti is said to be 'a Mandara-like in attracting Lakṣmī'. This may indicate that Puṣpabhūti did rule on some territory, howsoever small it may be in the area. This is further indicated by his ability 'to support all mankind.' He was "wind-like in sweeping away the bad passions of all kings." This shows that he might have come to conflicts with some rulers in his attempt to carve out a principality for his own line. His comparision with 'Śatrughna in battle'[29] may lend further support to our views cited above.

But one analogy is of great political importance to us. He is called 'a Śūra in vanquishing the Śūrasenas.' The learned editors appear to be doubtful about their approach to "Śūrasena" and, therefore, they translate it as the "armies" (*Senā*) of the 'heroes' (*Śūra*) and it is in the footnote they indicate that there is also a possibility of suggesting the conquest over the Śūrasenas.

---

27. *The learned editors of Harṣacharita suggest that it may also indicate Puṣpabhūti's exploits in conquering Śūrasena.* *HCCTH.*, *P.* 84.

28. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 84.; "सर्वादिराजतेजःपुञ्जनिर्मित इव राजा पुष्पभूतिरिति नाम्ना बभूव" *HCK.*, *P.* 44.

29. *At another place Bāṇa again tells us that he fought many battles.* *HCCTH.*, *P.* 94.; ह० च०, उ० तु०, पृ० ५२।

According to Pañcharātra Śūrasena stands for the country or inhabitants living in the area about Mathurā.[30] The Epics and the Purāṇas also support this evidence. Manu also includes the people of Śūrasena alongwith the famous warriors of Kuru, Matsya and Pāñchāla regions.[31] Śūrasena also appears to have been known to Greeks who call it Sourasenoi and its capital was Mathurā (*Methora*).[32] Pāṇini in his Aṣṭādhyāyī refers to Andhakas[33] and Vṛiṣṇis[34] of Mathurā but his silence about Śūrasena indicates that the name Śūrasena had not come into vogue in the days of Pāṇini. Several references in the Mahābhārata and the Purāṇas and various traditions make it clear that the country about Mathurā was known as Śūrasena.[35]

Bāṇa was a learned paṇḍita and from his accounts it becomes quite clear that he possessed a vast amount of knowledge of our various Saṁskrit works and historical information as it was then available. And the knowledge of the country and its geography was not altogether unknown to him.

It is, therefore, unthinkable that Bāṇa, who knows so much about Śrīkaṇṭha Janapada and Sthāṇvīśvara and other regions and towns may not have knowledge of Śūrasena. Therefore, Bāṇa's reference to Puṣpabhūti as a Śūra who conquered Śūrasena cannot be dismissed as altogether baseless.

TESTIMONY OF YUAN CHWANG

Yuan Chwang tells us that he first visited Mathurā (*Mo* (*or mei*)-

30. *Monierwilliams.*, *P.* 1086; कृ० द० बाजपेयी, ब्रज का इतिहास।
31. *Manu Smṛiti*, 7. 193.
32. *CA.*, *P.* 12.
33. *IV.* 1.114.
34. *VI.* 2.34.
35. कृष्णदत्त बाजपेयी, ब्रज का इतिहास।

Geographical data in Bāṇa's works reveal that he possessed a great deal of information pertaining to geographical study of India. It was probably the result of his wanderings during his early career that he learnt so much about various regions and towns and cities of India.

-t'a-lo).[36] From his description we learn that Mathurā was the capital as well as the country. He says that the country of Mathurā was above 5,000 li in circuit and its capital above twenty li in circuit.[37] He says that from Mathurā he proceeded North-East and reached Śthāneśvara (*Sa-t' a-ni-ssu.-fa-lo*) after a journey of above 500 li (*about* 100 *miles*).[38] Watters remarks that the pilgrim is "correct in his statement of distance and direction from Mathurā to Sthāneśvara.[39] Thus Mathurā, the capital of Śūrasena is about 100 miles from Sthāneśvara, the capital of the Puṣpabhūti, and it is not altogether improbable that Puṣpabhūti might have come to a clash with the Śūraśenas during his attempts to carve out a principality.

As a ruler he was kind and benevolent. He is said to have been "honoured by the citizens, dependents, councillors and neighbouring sovereigns, whom his arms might had conquered and made tributary."[40] This indicates his achievements as a conqueror and ruler.

His simple title of 'rājā',[41] and 'Bhūpāla', however, do not allow us to conclude that Puṣpabhūti enjoyed an independent status. It appears that during the confusion that followed the death of Kumāragupta I about 455 A.D., Puṣpabhūti might have made his attempts of laying the foundation of a kingdom. We know how the Puṣyamitras, Hūṇas and Mlechchhas had shaken the fortunes (*Kulalakṣmi*) of the Imperial Guptas. The political stability was soon re-established under Skandagupta and he (*Puṣpabhūti*) and his two or three immediate successors could not have succeeded in making further attempts to consolidate their position till we come to the time of Naravardhana.

HIS DATE

This appears to be a tentative hypothesis if we calculate the date

---

36. *Watters, I, P.* 301.
37. *Ibid., I, P.* 301.
38. *Ibid., I,* 314.
39. *Ibid., I,* 317.
40. *HCCTH., P.* 85; पौराः पादोपजीविनः सचिवा भुजबलनिर्जिताश्च करदीकृता महासामन्तास्तं सिषेविरे, ह० च०, तृ० उ०, पृ० ४५।
41. *HCCTH., Pp.* 83*f.*; *HCK., Pp.* 44*f.*

of Puṣpabhūti on the basis of the date of Harṣa. We know that Harṣa ruled from c. 606 A.D.. to c. 647 A.D.. His date of accession is almost fixed in the year 606 A.D.. At this time Harṣa was sixteen.[42]

We learn from Harṣacharita that Prabhākaravardhana had his children many years after his marriage and, therefore, we propose to fix Prabhākaravardhana's reign period after discussing all possibilities.

Dr. Radhakumud Mookerji, writing on some dates in the history of Harṣa and his predecessors, says, "The Harṣacharita contains some statements which Hoernle has cleverly utilized to arrive at some fairly precise dates in the history of Harṣa and his predecessors."[43] The opinion of the learned scholar in this connection that "the expedition of Rājya against the Hūṇas, Prabhākara's illness and death, Rājya's accession to the throne and death, all took place in the course of a year, A.D. 605-6", is quite convincing. His calculation that Harṣa was born in A.D. 590 also appears to be well worked out.[44] Vaidya,[45] writing earlier, has worked out more minutely and fixed Harṣa's birth on Sunday, the fourth June, A.D. 590. Rājya's birth, according to the learned scholar, must have taken place in 586 A.D..[46] He further observes that "thus their father could not have married Yaśovatī later than 585 A.D.",[47] and "as he had married soon after accession to the throne the latter event took place about A.D. 583....Thus, Prabhākaravardhana" according to Dr. Mookerji's calculations "ruled between A.D. 583-606."[48]

Similar is the view of Dr. Sinha who calculates on the same lines.[49] I respectfully submit that the marriage of Prabhākaravardhana with Yaśovatī

---

42. *Vaidya's calculation appears to be a workable hypothesis. HMHI., Vol. I, P.* 5, *Footnote* 2.

43. *Harṣa, Oxford,* 1926, *P.* 69.

44. *Ibid., P.* 69.

45. *HHHI., Vol. I,* 1921, *Pp.* 41-2.

46. *Harṣa, P.* 69.

47. *Ibid., P.* 69.

48. *Ibid., P.* 69.

49. *DKM., P.* 175, *Footnote* 4.

about A.D. 585 and the birth of Rājya about A.D. 586 are not well calculated. The learned scholars have failed to note some important hints in the Harṣacharita.

I want to draw the attention of the scholars to a passage in Harṣacharita which throws enough light on the gap between the marriage of Prabhākaravardhana and the birth of Rājyavardhana. Bāṇa tells us, "The king was by natural proclivity a devotee of the sun. Day by day at sunrise he bathed, arrayed himself in white silk, wrapt his head in a white cloth, and kneeling eastwards upon the ground in a circle smeared with saffron paste, presented for an offering a bunch of red lotuses set in a pure vessel of ruby and tinged, like his own heart, with the sun's hue. Solemnly at dawn, at midday, and at eve he muttered a prayer for offspring, humbly with earnest heart repeating a hymn having the sun as its centre."[50] Later when the queen Yaśovatī related her dream, the king said, "Our wishes are fulfilled. Our family goddesses have accepted you. In his graciousness the holy god of the radiant crown (*the sun*) will grant you joy, and that soon, by the gift of three noble children."[51] That Prabhākaravardhana was the worshipper of the sun is confirmed by the epigraphic evidence. It records that he was a devout worshipper of the sun and is given an epithet "Paramādityabhaktāḥ."

Thus it becomes clear that Prabhākaravardhana got the children after much expectation and after great and continuous worship of the sun. It cannot be assumed that he started these prayers to have children

---

50. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 104 "निसर्गत एव च स नृपतिरादित्यभक्तो बभूव। प्रतिदिन-भूदये दिनकृत: स्नात: सितदुकूलंधारी धवलकर्पटप्रावृत शिरा: प्राङ्मुख: क्षितौ जानुभ्यां स्थित्वा कुङ्कुमपंकानुलिप्ते मण्डलके पवित्रपटरागपात्रीनिहितेन स्वहृदयेनेव सूर्यानुरक्तेन रक्तकमलषण्डे-नार्घं ददा। अजपच्चजप्यं सुचरित: प्रत्युषसि मध्यन्दिने दिनान्ते चापत्यहेता: प्राहवं प्रयतेन मनसा जंजपूकोमन्त्रमादित्यहृदयम्।" ह० च०, च० उ०, पृ० ३।

51. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 106. पूर्णा नो मनोरथा: परिगृहीतासि कुलदेवताभि: प्रसन्नस्ते भगवानंशुमाली न चिरेणैवातिगुणवदपत्य त्रयलाभेनानन्दयति···भवतीम्। ह० च०, च०उ०, पृ०४। *In Bāṇa's other work Kādambarī we learn of such several steps taken by queen Vilāsvatī to get a son. Kādambarī, tr., Ridding, Pp.* 55-56; *Kādambarī, Ed. Parab, Pp.* 144-146.

immediately after the marriage. It is unthinkable for any newly-married couple to think in the terms of producing children from the very day of their marriage. It appears that for long after their marriage they had no children and to have children they performed many worships in order to please the god sun who was to bless them with children.

Another point that Bāṇa makes clear is that Prabhākaravardhana also consolidated his position before he had these sons. References to his conflicts with Hūṇas, kings of Sindhu, Gujrāt, Gāndhāra, Lāṭa and Mālvā[52] are made earlier than to the birth of the children and it is referred to in such a manner that it makes it certain that Prabhākaravardhana had conquered these kingdoms before he had these children. Neither we have any information to show that these conflicts took place before his accession to throne. Thus it appears almost certain that soon after coming to throne he consolidated the task of building a powerful kingdom and when his military exploits were over he started an era of peaceful reign. He, afterwards, like a real Hindu ruler, wished to be a father and in order to fulfil that desire he started prayers as he had not got children for long.

Thirdly, if we accept Dr. Mookerji's contention that Prabhākaravardhana married about 585 A.D. and that it was soon after this marriage his accession to the throne took place, we have to accept that he must have been about 25 at the time of marriage. normally a marriageable age in ancient times. And thus he cannot be more than fortyfive when Hūṇas renewed their incursion about 605 A.D.. Now it would appear strange that a father, who was only about fortyfive, sends his son Rājyavardhana, who had hardly attained the majority[53] and was born after so many continuous prayers. It may be argued that the task of defending the country was also entrusted to princes in our ancient political set-up, but they used

---

52. *HCCTH., P.* 101*; HCK.,* 4*th Canto. P.* 1. *A detailed study of these wars and conquests will be made later.*

53. *Bāṇa tells us that Rājya's beard showed a faint growth. HCCTH., P.* 166*; HCK., P.* 37. *This information makes it certain that Rājyavardhana must have been seventeen or eighteen, at the most, when the Hūṇas were to be faced by him. Faint growth of beard makes our conclusion well calculated.*

to participate generally with the kings. Or when the kings were quite old to take up arms, the princes were placed in singular charge of such expeditions. We know that Skandagupta fought his enemies in the life-time of his father, but we also know that Kumāragupta was very old at that time. He had ruled for nearly four decades when he was attacked by the enemies and had to depute his son to fight them.

Thus it appears quite reasonable to conclude that Prabhākara-vardhana must have been very old when Hūṇas renewed their attack and it was because of his old age he could not control the operations personally and entrusted the command to his eldest son.

Another point was the death of Prabhākaravardhana. We know that he died a natural death caused by severe illness. This further proves that he was quite old at the time of his death. He may be between sixty and seventy or above seventy when he died, and, thereofore, we have to admit that Prabhākaravardhana must have come to throne sometime about 565 A.D. and must have been born about 540 A.D..

Another point that goes to support our conclusion is the marriage of Mahāsenaguptā, daughter of Dāmodaragupta, with Prabhākaravardhana's father, Ādityavardhana, son of Rājyavardhana I.[54] All the sources reveal that Mahāsenaguptā was the mother of Prabhākaravardhana, but her relationship with Mahāsenagupta of the Later Gupta dynasty has been established on the basis of mere similarity of names. Nowhere we find any direct evidence of her relationship with Mahāsenagupta. C.V. Vaidya has discussed this problem in detail and he maintains that the marriage must have been materialized.[55] Dr. Raychaudhary favours such relationship.[56] Dr. Sinha says, "As Harṣaguptā was sister of Harṣagupta, Mahāsenaguptā was sister of Mahāsenagupta."[57] Dr. R. C. Majumdar

54. *Ep. Ind., Vol. I, Pp. 73f.; P. Ibid., Vol. IV, Pp.* 211*f; Ibid., Vol. XXI, Pp.* 74*f; CII., Vol. III, P.* 15 *and P.* 232*; JBORS.,* 1919, *P.* 302*; Ibid.,* 1920, *Pp.* 151-52.

55. *HMHI., Vol. I, Pp.* 36*f.*

56. *PHAI.,* 6*th Ed., Pp.* 606-607*; also Harṣa, P.* 60, *footnote* 1.

57. *DKM., P.* 175, *Footnote* 3.

unhesitatingly says that "this is mere speculation and no definite opinion is possible till more positive evidence is available."[58] Assuming that the marriage did take place, scholars suggest that Mahāsenaguptā was married by her brother to Ādityavardhana.[59] I think this marriage might have taken place during the time of Dāmodaragupta himself and the marriage might have been concluded about a couple of years earlier to 540 A.D., the date I propose to fix as the date of birth of Prabhākaravardhana.

Thus the marriage must have been performed about 538 A.D.. Prabhākaravardhana was born about 540 A.D. and came to throne about 565 A.D. and ruled for nearly four decades. His rule came to an end about 605 A D..[60] This appears as the most plausible and tentative hypothesis as these dates are corroborated by the epigraphic evidences.

On the basis of epigraphic evidences, we know that three generations had ruled over the kingdom of Thāneśvara from the time of Naravardhana to Prabhākaravardhana and if we allot the approximate period of nearly twenty years to each ruler we come to following chronology of the Puṣpabhūtis.

1. Naravardhana. (c. 505 to 525 A.D.)
2. Rājyavardhana I. (c. 525 to 545 A.D.)
3. Ādityavardhana. (c. 545 to 565 A.D.)
4. Prabhākaravardhana (c. 565 to 605 A. D.)
5. Rājyavardhana II (c. 605 to 606 A.D.)
6. Harṣavardhana (c. 606 to 647 A.D.)

This may indicate that between Puṣpabhūti, the founder (c. 455-475 A.D.) and Naravardhana (c. 505-525 A.D.) there is a gap of about 40 to 50 years and we can say that two or three rulers would have ruled in the intervening period.

If we examine the question further, we do not find any possibility of taking back the reign of Puṣpabhūti still beyond the year 455 A.D..

---

58. *CA.*, *P.* 97.

59. *DKM.*, *P.* 175.

60. *This, however, does not come in accordance with the chronology of the Later Guptas as suggested by Dr. Sinha. DKM., Pp.* 175*f.*

Any such possibility of taking back the emergence of Puṣpabhūti beyond this date can be ruled out on simple ground that any such attempt of carving out any political entity in the life-time of Kumāragupta I,[61] or during the reigns of his immediate predecessors Chandragupta II and Samudragupta, was not possible under these strong rulers. Thus it appears tentatively reasonable to conclude that Puṣpabhūti, taking an advantage of the political instability that followed the invasion by the Puṣyamitras and the Hūṇas against the ageing sovereign Kumāragupta I, established his own small kingdom. But we have seen that Skandagupta's indomitable personality soon crushed these enemies and re-established the law and order in the empire, and thus granted a further lease of life to his dynasty. Therefore, Puṣpabhūti and his two or three immediate successors could neither make any further attempts to become independent nor they could extend their territorial limits. And probably for their insignificant roles they do not find mention either in literary traditions or in family-records.

THE ORIGIN OF THE PUṢPABHŪTIS[62]

On the basis of Bāṇa's information that the two houses of Puṣpabhūtis and Maukharīs were like the moon and the sun,[63] I submit to treat

61. *His rule came to an end about* 455 *A.D.*.

62. *Referring to Pushpabhūti (rather Puṣpabhūti) Dr. Bühler writes that "the word gives no good sense. Pushyabhūti is a Nakshatra-name, and means "he to whom Pushya may give welfare." There are numerous similar ancient names like Ăshāḍhabhūti, Somabhūti, Indrabhūti and so forth." Ep. Ind., Vol. I, P.* 68, *footnote* 5. *This view of the learned scholar does not hold good grounds. It is indeed surprising to note how Dr. H. C. Raychaudhary follows Dr. Bühler in his suggestion. PHAI., 6th Ed. P.* 582, *footnote* 4. *Bāṇa, who had the first hand information of Harṣa and his family, refers to the founder in unmistakable term as Puṣpabhūti, who became the founder of the line of Puṣpabhūtis. All these manuscripts record it as Puṣpabhūti. And there is no point in suggesting that the word must be Puṣyabhūti simply because "the word gives no good sense."*

63. *HCCTH., P.* 128. "सोमसूर्य वंशाविव पुष्पभूतिमुखर वंशौ"।

हृ० च०, च० उच्छ०, पृ० १६।

it as feasible that the Maukharīs belonged to the solar line and the Puṣpabhūtis belonged to the lunar orgin.[64] And thus, if Bāṇa is believed, the Puṣpabhūtis were the Somavaṁśī kṣatriyas. But another contemporary of Harṣa, the Chinese pilgrim Yuan Chwang tells us that Harṣavardhana belonged to the "Fei-she" or Vaiśya caste.[65]

Thus it would appear that the evidences of the two contemporaries are opposed to each other. Commenting on the statement of Yuan Chwang, Cunningham opines that "it is a mistake," and "the pilgrim confounding the Vaisa or Bais Rājpūts with the Vaiśya caste."[66] Watters, making his remark on the comments of Cunningham says that he (Cunningham) "may be right." But he appears to be in a fix as he tells us that "we must remember that Yuan Chwang had ample opportunities for learning the antecedents of the royal family, and, he must have had some ground for his assertion."[67]

It is really difficult to judge who should be relied upon—Bāṇa or Yuan Chwang. On the basis of the wrong translation of a reference of Bāṇa, cited above, and the fact that the Puṣpabhūtis were mostly sun-

---

64. *Dr. Tripathi, however, does not agree to this view and says that the suffix "bhūti", indicating that Puṣpabhūti, the founder was a Vaiśya." Continuing further, the learned scholar observes that "the passage of Bāṇa was not actually connecting the two dynasties with the sun and the moon respectively, but he was merely comparing them with the two wellknown Kṣatriya houses." But referring to the Maukharīs he says "at least this much seems probable....that they were kṣatriyas."* THK., *Pp.* 30-31. *I most humbly submit that if Bāṇa's statement can be utilized to prove that Maukharīs were the Kṣatriyas, his statement cannot be set aside while discussing the origin of the Puṣpabhūtis. Bāṇa is an important author who was deeply connected with the family and, therefore, his statement suits more to the family of his patron than to that of the Maukharīs.*

65. *Watters, P.* 343.

66. *Cunningham, Ancient Geog. of India, P.* 377, *Quoted by Watters, I, Pp.* 343*ff.*

67. *Ibid., I, Pp.* 344-45.

worshippers,[68] it has been argued that the Puṣpabhūtis were of the solar race.[69] My submission is that they belonged to the lunar race if Bāṇa is to be believed at all.

Bühler,[70] on the other hand, agrees with Cunningham and says that the latter "is right when he asserts that the French translation of Hiuen Tsiang's "Fei-she" was wrong in making Harṣa of Vaiśya caste, and that the inter-marriages with the Rājpūt families of Valabhī and Mālvā (*recte Kanoj*) prove him to have been a 'Kṣatriya.'[71] Rājyaśrī's marriage can also be cited as another example of their matrimonial relationship with the Kṣatriyas. Bühler's identification of Harṣa's family with the modern Bais Rājpūts is also meaningful and reasonable. In his support to this view he further refers to Pāṇini.[72] The latter informs us

---

68. *Rājyavardhana I, Ādityavardhana, and Prabhākaravardhana are said to be the worshippers of the sun (Paramādityabhaktāḥ) Ep. Ind., Vol. I, P. 72.; Ibid, Vol. IV, P.* 210*; Ibid, Vol. XXI, P.* 74*f.; CII., Vol. III, No.* 52, *Pp.* 232*f.; JBORS.*, 1919, *P.* 302*; Ibid.*, 1920, *Pp.* 151-152. *Bāṇa also confirms Prabhākarvardhana's devotion to the sun. HCCTH., Pp.* 104 *and* 106*; HCK., 4th Canto, Pp.* 3-4. *This certainly proves that these rulers were worshippers of the sun but it is inexplicable to conclude that they were worshippers of the sun because of their family's association with the sun. Had it been so the successors of Prabhākaravardhana, Rājyavardhana and Harṣavardhana might also have been the worshippers of the sun. But they are known as Paramasaugata and Paramamāheśvara respectively. We have also seen that Puṣpabhūti, the founder of the line, was a staunch follower of Śaivism. As a matter of fact religious beliefs were the matter of personal conscience and faith. It has no connection with the origin of the family.*

69. *Cal. Review., Vol. XXVI*, 1928, *No.* 2, *P.* 203.

70. *Ep. Ind., Vol. I, P.* 68, *footnote* 4.

71. *She was married to Maukharī king Grahavarman, who was a Kṣatriya. THK., Pp.* 28-30.

72. *IV.* 1. 170. *Kielharn, Vol. II, P.* 269, *referred to in Ep. Ind., Vol. I, P.* 68, *footnote* 4.

of a country called 'Vaiśa' an inhabitant of which is named Vaiyśa (*Naisa and Naiṣya*)).[73]

TESTIMONY OF ĀRYAMAÑJUŚRĪMŪLAKALPA

This confusion is further confounded by Āryamañjuśrīmūlakalpa. On the basis of a few stanzas[74] of this work, Dr. Jayaswal, has tried to maintain that Viṣṇuvardhana-Yaśodharman of Thāneśvara was the founder of the Thāneśvar line of the Puṣpabhūtis.[75] The stanzas in question are highly ambiguous, misleading, erroneous and grammatically incorrect, and, therefore, the reference to Puṣpabhūtis in Āryamañjuśrīmūlakalpa as Vaiśyas can hardly be taken as historical evidence.[76]

The very basis of such a conclusion is weak and unfounded. Dr. Chatterjee confesses that Āryamañjuśrīmūlakalpa's stanzas in question are highly ambiguous,....full of linguistic errors and with the help of these passages, it is not only difficult, but impossible to arrive at any historical conclusion.[77] Same is said about Yuan Chwang's 'Fei-she.'[78]

We know that the sixth and seventh centuries are characteristically significant for their emphasis on the purity of Varṇas. A majority of the

---

73. *Ibid., I, P.* 68, *footnote* 4. *This variation is according to a majority of manuscripts. Ibid., I, P.* 68.

74. विष्णुप्रभवौ तत्र महाभोगो धनिनो तदा ॥६१४॥
मध्यमात् तौ मकाराद्यो मंत्रिमुख्यो उभातदा।
धनिनौ......................॥६१५॥
ततः परेण भूपालो जातानाभुनुजेश्वरौ ॥६१६॥
सप्तमष्टशता त्रीणि श्रीकण्ठवासिनस्तदा।
आदित्यनामा वैश्यास्तु स्थानमीश्वर वासिनः ॥६१७॥
भविष्यति न संदेहो अते सर्वत्र भूपतिः।
हकाराख्यो नामतः प्रोक्तो सार्वभूमिनराधिपः ॥६१८॥
quoted from Jayaswal's Imp. Hist. of Ind., Sans. Text., P. 45.

75. *Jayaswal, Imp. Hist. of India, P.* 28.

76. *G. Chatterjee, Harṣavardhan, Pp.* 64-66.

77. *Ibid., Pp.* 64-65 *also Pp.* 443-44.

78. *Ep. Ind., Vol. I, P.* 68, *footnote* 4.

inscriptions of this period refer to ruling kings who did their best to maintain the order of Varṇa and Āśrama. Prabhākaravardhana is also said to have maintained the order of Varṇa and Āśrama (*Varṇāśramavyavasthāpanapravṛittāḥ*), and we can expect that this epithet could not have been assigned to him in the inscriptions of his son if he himself did not maintain that order. In this period, particularly, we cannot expect intercaste marriages on a mass scale. We have seen that Prabhākaravardhana's mother appears to have been a Gupta princess.[79] Prabhākaravardhana's daughter was married to prince Grahavarman, son of Avantivarman of the famous Maukharī line. Harṣa's (*grand* ?) daughter was married to Dhruvasena II, the Valabhī ruler.[80] These matrimonial alliances could not have been possible had Puṣpabhūti been the Vaiśyas. The last two alliances could, at least, be tolerated as anuloma marriages, but the marriage of Gupta princess Mahāsenaguptā with Ādityavardhana was unthinkable in a period when great importance was attached to the purity of Varṇas.

Moreover, Bāṇa's information about Harṣa's family, if not about his political achievements, is most trustworthy and we must conclude with his verdict that the Puṣpabhūtis were Kṣatriyas of Lunar line.

THE FOUNDER OF THE FAMILY

With this brief reference to the origin of the Puṣpabhūtis we must come back to Puṣpabhūti's life and achievements. He was a great devotee of Śiva and is called Paramamāheśvara by Bāṇa[81] and "not even in dreams did he take food without worshipping the lord 'Śiva' (*vṛaṣabhadhvaja*)." This devotion to Śiva was so earnest and singular that he "thought the three world void of all other deities."[82]

Once he heard of a great South Indian (*Dakṣiṇātya*) śaivite saint (*mahāśaivaṁ*) Bhairavāchārya "who was famous for his excellence in

---

79. *PHAI., 6th. Ed., P.* 605; *DKM., P.* 175, *footnotes* 3 *and* 4.

80. *K. Virji, Anc. Hist. of Saurāṣṭra, P. 74.*

81. *HCCTH., P.* 85, अकृतवृषभध्वज पूजा विधिर्नस्वप्नेप्याहारमकरोत... ...पशुपतिं प्रपन्नोऽन्य देवताशून्यममन्यत त्रैलोक्यम् ॥ हृ० च०, तृ० उ०, पृ० ४५ ॥

82. *HCCTH., P.* 85; हृ० च०, तृ० उच्छ्०, पृ० ४५ ।

multifarious sciences" (*bahuvidhavidyāprabhāva prakhyātairguṇaiḥ*) and "whose thousands of disciples were spread abroad over the whole world" (*Śiṣyair ivā nekasahasrasaṁkhairvyāpatāmartyalokaṁ*)).[83] When the king heard of the Sādhu, who was staying on the bank of Sarasvatī, he went to pay his respect to Bhairavāchārya. On the next day, Bhairavāchārya, on his part, went to see the king. The latter received the former with great warmth and hospitableness.[84]

One day the śaivite saint presented the king a sword called Aṭṭahāsa, received by Pātālasvāmin, a Brāhmaṇa disciple of Bhairavāchārya, from the hand of a Brahmarākṣasa.[85] On another occasion he suggested to the king to perform a great ceremonial rite called "Mahākālahṛidaya" in the great cemetery (*mahāsmaśāne*) and told that "its completion would end with the laying of a goblin" (*tasya vetālasādhanavasanā siddhiḥ*). Its performance, he said, would require three assistants, Ṭīṭibha, an old friend of Bhairavāchārya, Pātālasvāmin, the old medicant and associate of Bhairavāchārya, and his Draviḍian disciple, Karṇatāla.

The king agreed to perform it and on the fourteenth day of the dark fortnight (*kriṣṇachaturdaśyāṁ*) all persons reached the appointed place at the cemetery.[86] The ceremony was properly performed, and, as desired, the goddess was seen in the circle of ashes drawn at the graveyard.-[87] She told the king, "I am ravished by the valorous spirit. Crave of me a boon : I will give thee thy heart's desire."[88] The king "bowed to her" (*rājā tāṁ praṇamya*) and "heedless of his own advantage" (*svārthavimukho*) ukho) "besought" (*yayāche*) "the success" (*siddhiṁ*) of Bhairavāchārya. The godess (*Devī*) "was highly gratified" (*prītatarahṛidayā*) "with her

83. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 85; ह० च०, तृ० उच्छ०, पृ० ४५।

84. *HCCTH.*, *Pp.* 85-89.

85. *A degraded Brāhmaṇa—Manu says* : "संयोग पतितगंत्वा परस्यैव च योषितम्। अप्रहृत्य च विप्रस्वंभवति ब्रह्मराक्षसः॥ मनुस्मृति, १२।६०।

86. *HCCTH.*, *Pp.* 88-89.

87. *Ibid.*, *Pp.* 94-95.

88. *Ibid.*, *P.* 97; "अपहृतास्मि तवामुना शौर्यरसेन। याचस्व। ददामि ते वरमभिलाषितम्॥" ह० च०, तृ० उच्छ०, पृ० ५३।

wide open eyes" (*vistiryamānena chakṣuṣā*) anointed (*abhiṣiñchanti*) "the king" (*bhūpālaṁ*) and said, "So be it. Because of this magnanimity of thine and because of thy superlative devotion to the holy lord Śiva thou, like a third added to the sun and moon, shalt be the founder of a mighty line of kings persisting unbroken upon the earth, daily increasing in greatness, full of matchless heroes elate with purity, high fortune, truth, munificence and fortitude. Wherein shall arise an emperor named Harṣa, governor like Hariśchandra of all the continents, world-conquering like a second Māndhātrī, 'whose chowrie, this hand, spontaneously abondoning the lotus, shall grasp."[89]

This story as related by Bāṇa is quite interesting, but it appears that it has little historical importance. When little is known about a great hero, a halo of romance is generally gathered round his name and origin. Obscurity is the mother of various legends growing around many kings and dynasties. But this story unmistakably gives an impression that Puṣpabhūti, the founder of the line, had a great faith, in such supernatural ceremonies and rituals and as such he might have performed this ceremony to seek a great future for his line.

Bāṇa does not refer to any of the immediate successors of Puṣpabhūti. He simply tells us that from the latter "there issued a line of kings"...."born free from the stain of violating Dharma" (*avinaṣṭadharmadhavalāḥ*) "dominating the world by their splendour" *pratāpākrāntabhuvanaḥ*) "thronging the regions with their armies in array" (*vigrahavyāptadiṅgamukhā*), "strong to support the world" (*Dharaṇidhāraṇakṣmā*), "rising in might to guard the oceans" (*Udadhinpātumudyatā*). Thus these achievements are collectively attributed to the kings intervening between Puṣpabhūti and Prabhākaravardhana without making any

---

89. एवमस्तु अनेनसत्त्वोत्कर्षेण भगवच्छिवभट्टारक भक्त्या चासाधारणया भवान्भुवि सूर्यचन्द्रमसोस्तृतीय इवाविच्छिन्नस्य प्रतिदिनमुपचीयमानवृद्धेः शुचिसुभग सत्यत्याग धैर्यशौण्डपुरुषप्रकाण्डप्रायस्य महतो राजवंशस्य कर्त्ता भविष्यति। यस्मिन्नुत्पत्स्यते सर्वद्वीपानां भोक्ता हरिश्चन्द्र इव हर्षनामा चक्रवर्ती त्रिभुवन विजयीषुर्द्वितीयो मान्धातेव यस्यायं करः स्वयमेव कमलमपहाय ग्रहीष्यति चामरम्

—ह० च०, तृ० उच्छ०, पृ० ५३-५४ *HCCTH., P. 97.*

individual reference to any of them, and it is difficult to judge the element of historical facts in this description. What we can gather from Bāṇa is the information that all the rulers who immediately succeeded Puṣpabhūti, the founder, and preceded Prabhākaravardhana had done their best to promote an advancement of the power of their family.

It is really surprising to note as to why Bāṇa, who was a great learned Paṇḍita and who has recorded so many minute details pertaining to the lives of Puṣpabhūti, Prabhākaravardhana and Harṣa, does not mention the names of the intervening rulers. Epigraphic evidences, however, supplement Bāṇa, and we learn of three generations preceding Prabhākaravardhana. Harṣa's two inscriptions, Bānskhera[90] and Madhubana[91] of the years 628-29 A.D. and 631-32 A.D. respectively, his Sonapat[92] and Nālandā[93] seals prove the existence of the following rulers who preceded Prabhākaravardhana. But it is surprising to note why these state documents make no reference to Puṣpabhūti or to any of the immediate predecessors of Naravardhana. All of them start the family genealogy from Naravardhana.

EARLY KINGS OF THE FAMILY

1. *NARAVARDHANA*

As he is the first to be referred to in the records of his family, it appears that Naravardhana was the first to bring his family in the comity of feudatories. We have seen that Bāṇa refers to Puṣpabhūti simply as 'rājā', but Naravardhana in all records is known as 'Mahārāja'. This is significant and it shows that he certainly enjoyed superior political position as compared to that of Puṣpabhūti and the intervening rulers between Puṣpabhūti and himself. As we have noted elsewhere that the title of Mahārāja in these days had lost much political significance, Naravardhana

---

90. *Ep. Ind., Vol. IV, Pp.* 208*f.*

91. *Ibid., Vol. I, Pp.* 67-75.

92. *CII., Vol. III, No.* 52, *Pp.* 231-32.

93. *Ep. Ind., Vol. XX, Pp.* 74*f.; JBORS.,* 1919, *P.* 302*; Ibid.,* 1920, *Pp.* 151-52.

might not have become fully independent. He might have been a feudatory ruler. And it appears that he owed allegiance to the Imperial Guptas.[94] His wife was Vajriṇīdevī.

2. *RĀJYAVARDHANA I*

Naravardhana's son (putra) was Rājyavardhana I, born from (*utpannaḥ*) his queen Vajriṇīdevī. As he is said to have meditated upon his father's feet (*tatpādānudhyātaḥ*) he was certainly the immediate successor of Naravardhana. He is said to be a "most devout worshipper of the sun (*paramādityabhakto*). He, too, assumed the simple title of Mahārāja and it appears that he was also a feudatory chief. But he appears to be instrumental in furthering the cause of his family. This is clear from the matrimonial alliance concluded with the Later Guptas.[95] His queen was Apsarā Devī.

3. *ĀDITYAVARDHANA*

He was the son and successor of Rājyavardhana I, whose mother was queen Apsarā Devī. As noted above, his marriage with princess Mahāsenaguptā Devī, sister of Mahāsenagupta, the ruler of the Later Gupta dynasty, was of great political significance.[96] We do not know whether this marriage was negotiated and concluded within the lifetime of his father

---

94. *Nothing definite can be said about their allegiance to the sovereign power. Majumdar says that the first three kings were "feudatory chiefs acknowledging the supremacy either of the Hūṇas or of the Guptas or of both at different times. It is also very likely that the Maukharīs excercised supremacy over them." CA., P.* 97. *Acknowledgement of the supremacy of the Guptas or the Maukharīs is feasible, but any such respect to the Hūṇas seems improbable. We will see later that Prabhākaravardhana was at constant war with the Hūṇas.*

95. *DKM., P.* 175, *Footnotes* 3 *and* 4.

96. *It is just an assumption from her "Gupta" cognomen. JBORS., Vol. XIX, Pp.* 399*f; Saletore, Life in the Gupta Age, P.* 63*; Dandekar, A History of the Guptas, Poona,* 1941, *P.* 174. *This marriage is supposed to have taken place about* 565 *A.D. Ibid., P.* 175, *footnote* 4.

Rājyavardhana I or during his own times. What is important is the conclusion of this matrimonial alliance which must have enhanced the prestige of the Puṣpabhūtis and that it must have helped them in their political designs. Dr. R. C. Majumdar rightly opines that it "marks a definite step in their rise to power and importance."[97] The Puṣpabhūti kingdom was on way to attain independent status which was fully materialized during the times of Prabhākaravardhana. Ādityavardhana is said to be "the most devout worshipper of the sun" (*paramādityabhakto*).

Referring to the first three rulers Bühler observes that all the three rulers receive the simple title of Mahārāja, and on that basis it appears that "their power was not great, and it is even doubtful if they were independent."[98]

4. *PRABHĀKARAVARDHANA*

Ādityavardhana's son and successor was Prabhākaravardhana, born (*utpannaḥ*) from his queen Mahāsenaguptā. He was certainly the first in the family to embark upon his schemes of complete independent rule and appears to have materialized it successfully.[99] This is clear from the title of Mahārājādhirāja which he assumed according to all sources-epigraphic[100] and literary.[101] Harṣa's records[102] inform us that he was

---

97. *CA.*, *P.* 97.

98. *Ep. Ind.*, *Vol. I*, *P.* 69.

99. *This is further proved by his coronation. Bāṇa says that 'from his members of royalty the coronation water purged no foulness but filthy lucre,' indicating that at his coronation his ministers distributed money. HCCTH.*, *P.* 101. 'यो राज्यांगसंगीन्यभिषिच्यमा न एव मलानीव मुमौच घनानि " हर्षचरित, चतु० उच्छ०, पृ० १

100. *Ep. Ind.*, *Vol. I*, *Pp.* 72-3; *Ibid.*, *Vol. IV*, *Pp.* 208-11; *Ibid.*, *Vol. XXI*, *P.* 74; *CII.*, *Vol. III*, *No.* 52, *P.* 231-2., *JBORS.*, 1919, *P.* 302; *Ibid.*, 1920, *Pp.* 151-152; *THK.*, *P.* 78.

101. *Bāṇa calls him "rājādhirāja", i.e. 'King of Kings'. HCCTH.*, *P.* 101.

102. *Ep. Ind.*, *Vol. I*, *Pp.* 67-75; *Ibid.*, *Vol. IV*, *Pp.* 208-211; *Ibid.*, *XXI. Pp.* 74-76; *CII.*, *Vol. III*, *No.* 52, *Pp.* 231-232.

called 'Paramabhaṭṭāraka' and 'Mahārājādhirāja.' Commenting on this Bühler has observed that "he must have been an independent sovereign and a man of some consequence" and "no doubt owed his prosperity to his valour."[103] His "fame passed beyond four occeans" (*Chatussamudrātikkrāntakīrtiḥ*).[104] His conquest over the kings of Sindhu and Lāṭa (Bharoch) must have helped him in extending his sphere of infleunce far and wide and his territories or his zone of influence might have touched the oceans. But we cannot take it for granted that his "fame passed beyond four occeans." It was used as a vague generalization. Bāṇa tells us that he was also famous under a second name (*prathitāparanāmā*) Pratāpaśīla.[105]

HIS WARS AND CONQUESTS

Bāṇa's rich and liberal pen has written much about Prabhākaravardhana and his achievements, but most of his descriptions are full of poetical exaggeration and magniloquence and we have to examine critically his references to Prabhākaravardhana's territorial designs, military engagements and political gains.

Bāṇa says that Prabhākaravardhana was "a lion to Hūṇa deer, a burning fever to the king of Sindhu, a troubler of the sleep of Gurjaras, a bilious plague to that scent-elephant, the lord of gandhara, a looter to or destroyer of the lawlessness of Lāṭas, and an axe to creeper of Mālvā's Laskṣmī i.e. fortune or sovereignty."[106]

Now I propose to examine the statement of Bāṇa pertaining to political achievements of Prabhākaravardhana.

1. *HIS WAR WITH THE HŪṆAS*

It has been maintained that Mihirakula was finally subjugated by

---

103. *Ep. Ind., Vol. I, P.* 69.

104. *Ibid., P.* 69; *Ibid., Vol. IV, P.* 208-11; *Ibid., Vol. XXI, P.* 75.

105. *HCCTH., P.* 101 हृ० च०, च० उच्छ०, पृ० १।

106. *HCCTH., P.* 101. "हूणहरिणकेसरी सिन्धुराजज्वरो गुर्जरप्रजागरो गान्धाराधिपगन्धद्विपकूटपाकलो लाटपाटव पाटच्चरो मालवलक्ष्मी लतापरशुः।"

—हृ० च०, च० उ०, पृ० १॥

Janendra Yaśodharmana sometime before 533 A.D..[107] After Mihirakula, we certainly do not come across any other great Hūṇa chief who could have successfully tried to make further intrusions. But they did not disappear wholly from the Indian scene. Śūlikas of Haraha inscription are supposed to be Hūṇas by some scholars[108] and it was Iśānavarman who conquered the Śūlikas[109] and his son and successor Sarvavarman inflicted another defeat on the Hūṇas.[110]

Next reference to Hūṇas is in the Aphṣaḍ inscription. On the basis of two fragmentary seals we learn of Mahārāja Lavakhāna and Mahārāja Jarivā.[111] They may be identified with Lakhana Narendrāditya of the Rājataraṅgiṇī[112] and Lakkhana Udayātiya of the coins.[113] These epigraphic and numismatic evidences conclusively prove that with the defeat of Mihirakula Hūṇas did not disapperar completely and they continued to disturb Indian politics whenever they found occasion for it.

Shri Vaidya has fully relied upon the statement of Bāṇa and opines that he (*Prabhākaravardhana*) "had defeated and humbled the Hūṇas who, notwithstanding their signal defeat in the previous century... were still a powerful people in the Punjāb and had their kingdoms at Gāndhāra or Peshavar and at Śākala or Sialkot."[114] Dr. Radhakumud Mookerji[115] and Dr. Pannikar[116] hold similar views. But Dr. Tripathi

---

107. *PHAI., 6th Ed., Pp.* 596-597. *But some scholars have maintained that "it was not Yaśodharman but Narasiṁhagupta Bālāditya who dealt a final blow to the Hūṇas." JBRS., Vol. XLV., Parts I-IV, P.* 131.

108. *JDL.; Vol. XXI, Pp.* 1-10*; S. Chattopadhyaya, Early History of North India, P.* 223.

109. *CII., Vol. III, No.* 42, *Pp.* 200-208.

110. *Ibid., Vol. III, No.* 42, *Pp.* 200-208.

111. *IHQ., Vol. XIX, Pp.* 188-189.

112. *JBRS., Vol. XLV, Parts* 1-4 *(Altekar Memorial Vol.), P.* 139.

113. *Ibid., P.* 139, *footnote* 159.

114. *HMHI., Vol. I, P.* 1.

115. *Harṣa, P.* 11.

116. *Sri Harsha of Kanauj, Pp.* 9-10.

found it difficult to agree with Dr. Mookerji and Pannikar and says that the passage "hardly warrants such conclusion."[117] He says further that "there is evidence that the "Hūṇa deer," instead of being over-awed and cowed, was trying to pounce upon the "lion" himself for towards the close of his reign and the kingdom was seriously disturbed by the Hūṇa menace, and Prabhākaravardhana had to despatch the crown prince at the head of a strong force to cope with the danger."[118] Like Dr. Tripathi, Dr. R. C. Majumdar also appears to be doubtful about Prabhākaravardhana's engagement with the Hūṇas.[119] He says, "This poetical description leaves us in doubt whether he actually defeated these powers or was a mere threat to them. About Hūṇas we are told later that shortly before his death, Prabhākaravardhana sent a military expedition under his elder son Rājyavardhana to Uttarāpatha. But the result of the expedition is not known; probably no conflict took place as Rājyavardhana was suddenly called back on account of the illness of his father."[120]

The common point in the approach of Dr. Tripathi and Dr. Majumdar is the renewal of the Hūṇa invasion during the closing years of Prabhākaravardhana's reign. But both of them do not appear to give any credit of victory to the forces of Prabhākaravardhana headed by Rājyavardhana. With due respect to these learned scholars, I fail to understand how they come to such conclusions. Dr. Tripathi doubts on the ground that the Hūṇas renewed the invasion during the closing years of Prabhākaravardhana's reign. Any conquest achieved against a particular power cannot be treated as a guarantee of any further non-involvement of that power in further conflicts with the victor. Had it been so the Hūṇas might have withdrawn from the Indian scene after their defeat at the hands of Skandagupta. But we find that soon after that defeat they made several attacks and suffered successive defeats, such as the defeats at the hands of Narsiṁhagupta Bālāditya and at those of

117. *THK.*, *P.* 79.
118. *Ibid.*, *P.* 79.
119. *CA.*, *Pp.* 97-98.
120. *Ibid.*, *P.* 98.

Yaśodharmana of Mandsaur. There are several instances of many invaders who did not lose courage at the first defeat and renewed invasions time and again.

Secondly, there is a long gap between the first engagement between the Hūṇas and Prabhākaravardhana and the next one between Rājyavardhana and the Hūṇas. The latter might have thought that the old emperor would not be able to repulse them, and that they would avenge the insult of their first defeat. Dr. Majumdar finds it doubtful because our source of information is Bāṇa's poetical description. Bāṇa is a great writer and we cannot dismiss his evidence because he was a poet. The fact is that he was a biographer of Harṣa. Dr. Majumdar's another conclusion that "probably no conflict took place" is also unconvincing and baseless in light of facts supplied by Bāṇa.[121] The latter describes Rājyavardhana's return in these words "....the elder brother came in sight amid a throng of servants pale and worn with many days' neglect of bathing, eating and sleeping, and reduced in number by their long and rapid march."[122] The "umbrella-bearer was wanting" (*Vichchhinnachchhatradhārena*)" "the superintendent of the wardrobe lagged behind" (*lambitāmbaravāhina*), "the pitcher-carrier had collapsed" (*bhriṣṭabhṛiṅgāragrāhiṇā*), "the spitton-bearer was prostrate" (*chyutāchamanadhārinā*), "the betel-bearer panted" (*tāmyatāmbūlikena*), "sword-bearer limped" (*khañjatkhaṅgagrāhiuā*). This description can also be depicted as the result of overwhelming grief caused by his father's death. But what Bāṇa says later, is certainly significant while discussing Rājyavardhana's expedition against the Hūṇas. "Long white bandages" says Bāṇa, "bound about arrow-wounds received in the battle while conquering the Hūṇas, dotted his form like side glances from his approaching royal glory."[123] His "limbs were

---

121. *HCCTH.*, *Pp.* 165*ff.* "बहुवासरान्तरित स्नान भोजन शयनश्यामक्षामवपुषा परिजनेन परिवृतम अविरल मार्ग धूलिधूसरित शरीर तया शरणी कृतमि..."

—ह० च०, ष० उ०, पृ० ३६।

122. *Ibid.*, *P.* 165.

123. *Ibid.*, *P.* 165. "हूणनिर्जयसमरशरव्रणवद्धपट्टकदीर्घ धवलः समासन्न राज्यलक्ष्मी कटाक्षपातखिशबलीकृतकायम।।" ह० च०, ष० उ०, पृ० ३६।

emaciated, as though for the preservation of king's life he had offered his flesh."[124] This statement of Bāṇa clearly shows that the disturbance caused by the Hūṇas was not of ordinary nature. Rājyavardhana was dispatched with an "immense force" (Aparimitabala)[125] and his "long white bandages bound about arrow-wounds received in the battle" and he returned with "limbs emaciated" bring to our notice more evidences than we require to prove serious active military operations between Rājyavardhana and the Hūṇas.

And that there was no renewal of the Hūṇa invasion after this historic march of Rājyavardhana proves further that Rājyavardhana's mission was a brilliant military success. Had it not been so the barbarous Hūṇas would have certainly utilized an apportunity provided by Prabhākaravardhana's death and brutal murder of Grahavarman followed by that of Rājyavardhana ? Thus the victory of Rājya against the Hūṇas was decisive. By this conquest and others Prabhākaravardhana must have certainly "had raised himself to considerable eminence,"[126] and won much political glory in north Indian politics.[127]

With regard to other wars fought by Prabhākaravardhana, scholars appear to have been divided on the issue. Smith says these wars were "successful" and it was by them Prabhākaravardhana enhanced his status and prestige considerably.[128] C.V. Vaidya supports Smith and says that he was "undoubtedly the premier king of Northern India" who "defeated and humbled" the powers as referred to in Harṣacharita.[129] About A.D.

While referring to Rājya's anger at the news of Grahavarman's murder, he again refers to his fresh wounds, caused in Hūṇa war. HCCTH., P. 174.

124. *Ibid., P.* 166. 'शबलीकृतकायम्, अवनिपतिप्राणपरित्राणार्थमिव'
॥ ह० च०, ष० उच्छ०, पृ० ३६ ॥

125. *HCCTH., P.* 132.

126. *EHI., 4th Ed., P.* 349.

127. *B. C. Sen, Historical Aspects of the Inscriptions of Bengal, P.* 258. *Pannikar; Śri Harṣa of Kanauj, Pp.* 9-10; *JBRS., Vol. XLV, Parts I-IV, P.* 130.

128. *EHI., 4th Ed., P.* 349.

129. *HMHI., Vol. I, P.* 1.

605, he was "by far the most powerful king in Hindustan and he was well justified in assuming the titles of "Mahārājādhirāja" and "Paramabhaṭṭāraka."[130] Dr. Mookerji adds that he "very nearly attains the position of an emperor by subduing or over-awing a number of countries and peoples all over Northern India."[131] Dr. Tripathi, too, who does not fully agree to above conclusions, opines that "making allowance for exaggeration, it appears that in the above passage of Harşacharita we have only a poetical description of Prabhākaravardhana's excellence and greatness as compared with the other contemporary rulers."[132] On the other hand Dr. G. Chattopadhyaya does not find any basis for these conquests.[133] Dr. Majumdar, referring to Bāṇa's list of six rulers who are said to have been conquered, says that the "poetical description leaves us in doubt whether he actually defeated these powers or was a mere threat to them."[134]

It appears that Bāṇa's other references to Prabhākaravardhana's other achievements escaped the attention of the learned scholars. In Harşacharita queen Yaśovatī tells Harşa who wanted to dissuade her from entering into fire to die unwidowed. She says, "Have you forgotton that I am the lioness mate of a great spirit, who like a lion had his delight in a hundred battles. Daughter, spouse, mother of heroes, how otherwise could such a woman as I, whose price was valour, act ? This hand has been clasped by even such a hero, thy father, 'a chief among princes,' peer of Bhārata, Bhagīratha, and Nābhāga. Upon this head have the subservient wives of 'countless feudatories' poured coronation water from golden ewers. This forehead, in winning the honourable fillet of chief queen, has enjoyed a thing scarce accessible to desire. These breasts have worn robes swayed by the wind of 'chowries waved

---

130. *Ibid., P.* 2.
131. *Harşa, P.* 11.
132. *THK., P.* 79.
133. *Harşavardhana, P.* 67.
134. *CA., Pp.* 97-98.

by captive wives of foes' they have been sucked by sons like you."[135]

Bāṇa, while concluding his other military exploits, says, "From his members of royalty the coronation water purged no foulness but filthy lucre.[136] Even an enemy's life, that coward's darling, when kept like a straw in the mouth of battle, filled him with shame. It was torture to him to be accompanied in battle even by his image in the sword-blade.... that even his bow bent to the foe in conflict...." "Levelling on every side hills and hollows, clumps and forests, trees and grass, thickets and an-thills, mountains and caves, the broad path of his armies seemed to portion out the earth"....He adds further, "A furious onslaught he counted a present, war a favour, the approach of battle a festival, a foe the discovery of a treasure, a host of enemies the acme of prosperity, a challenge to conflict a boon...."[137]

This praise is certainly highly exaggerating but we get something out of it. He was a great fighter. It was his personal gain to expand the limits of his kingdom.

---

135. *HCCTH., P.* 153. 'किं विस्मृतोऽसिमाम समरशत शौण्डस्य पुरुषप्रकाण्डस्य केशरिण इवकेशरिणीं गृहिणीम्। एवं विधेन पित्रा ते भरत भगीरथ नाभागनिभेन नरेन्द्रवृन्दारकेण गृहीतः पाणिः। आसेवितः सेवा संभ्रान्तानन्तसामन्तसीमन्तिनीसमावर्जित जाम्बूनदघटाभिषेकः शिरसा। लब्धो मनोरथ दुर्लभो महादेवी पट्टबन्ध सत्कारलाभो ललाटेन। आमीतायुष्मद्विधैः पुत्रैरमित्रकलत्रबन्दीवृन्द विधूयमानचामरमरुच्चलचीनांशुक धरा पयोधरौ।'

—ह० च०, पं० उच्छ०, पृ० ३० ॥

136. *HCCTH., P.* 101। "यो राज्यांगसंगीन्यभिषिच्यमान एव मलानीव मुमोचधनानि"

—ह० च०, च० उ०, पृ० १ ॥

Editors of Harṣacharita explain that at his coronation his ministers distributed money. Ibid., P. 101, *footnote* 3.

137. *HCCTH., Pp.* 101-2. "यः परकीयेणापि कातरवल्लभेन रणमुखे तृणेनेव धृते नालज्जत जीवितेन। यः करधृत धातासि प्रतिबिम्बितेनात्मनाप्यदूयतं समितिषु सहायेन रिपुणं पुरः प्रचलेषु धनुषापि नमता...यस्य सर्वासु दिक्षु समीकृत सरित्तटावत विटपाटनी तरुतृणगुल्म वल्मीकगिरि गह्नैर्दण्ड यात्रापथैः प्रथुभिर्भूत्योपयोगाय व्यभजतेव वसुधां बहुधा (यश्च वरमुपायनं विग्रहमनुग्रहं समरागमं महोत्सवं शत्रुं निधिदर्शनमरि बाहुल्यमभ्युदयमाह वाह्वानं वरप्रदानम्...'

—ह० च०, च० उच्छ० पृ० १-२ ॥

14

Bāṇa's references to 'hundred battles,' 'countless feudatories' and 'captive wives of foes' certainly indicate his successful engagements with the adversaries. We have seen that all his predecessors enjoyed the status of 'Mahārāja' whereas Prabhākaravardhana is called 'Mahārājādhirāja' in all records. This certainly proves that he enjoyed considerable political power and was an independent king who enjoyed allegiance of many feudatories.

It is quite likely that he assumed this title of 'Mahārājādhirāja' after his successes in various battles. Another important information is about his coronation which was attended by 'countless feudatories.' This celebration of the coronation ceremony does indicate his independent status.

Now we propose to discuss other campains of Prabhākaravardhana.

2. *HIS CAMPAIGN AGAINST MĀLVĀ*

We do not know definitely who ruled over Mālvā at that time. It was probably Devagupta, a scion of Mahāsenagupta's family or his predecessor. According to Dr. Mookerji[138], Prabhākaravardhana's adversary in Mālvā was king Śilāditya, son and successor of Yaśodharmana whose reign came to an end about 583 A.D.. He maintains that Prabhākaravardhana attacked him as a leader of a confederacy consisting of the Maukharis of Kanauj, Vardhanas of Thāneśvara and the Guptas of Eastern Mālvā. It has also been pointed out that Prabhākaravardhana "regarded himself as a special rival of Śilāditya from the fact that his wife queen Yaśovatī was the daughter of Yaśodharmana Vikramāditya. Thus it was a contest between a son and a son-in-law for the Mālvā imperial throne."[139] These views of the learned scholar appear to be unwarranted and he, unfortunately, has not given any basis to arrive at such conclusions. In absence of any positive basis for them, these views cannot claim any historical importance. The Mālvā ruler appears to have been subdued

138. *Harṣa, Pp.* 59*f.*

139. *Ibid., Pp.* 59*f.*

and this is further proved by his behaviour at the time of Prabhākaravardhana's death and afterwards.

3. *THE WAR AGAINST THE GURJARAS*

Smith suggests that they were "probably of Rājputānā, but possibly those of the Gurjara kingdom in the Punjāb, now represented by the Gujarāt and Gujarānwālā Districts."[140] But as Punjāb was already under his possession, he must have made attempts to conquer and to subjugate the kingdoms in the vicinity of Punjāb. And, therefore, "the Gurjaras whose sleep was troubled" by Prabhākaravardhana, appear to have been the Gurjaras of the line founded by Harichandra in Rājaputānā.[141]

4. *CONQUEST OF GĀNDHĀRA*

Bāṇa tells us that Prabhākaravardhana was "a bilious fever to that scent-elephant, the lord of Gāndhāra (*Gāndhāradhipagandhadvipakūṭapākalo*)).[142] By Gāndhāra, the region around modern Kandahār is denoted and Prabhākaravardhana is said to be the "bilious fever" or "the deadliest of all the fevers"[143] to the king of Gāndhāra may indicate that the king of Gāndhāra must have suffered a serious set-back and that the kingdom was annexed to the domain of Prabhākaravardhana.

5. *EXPEDITION AGAINST THE SINDHU KING*

The reference to the kingdom of Sindha is vaguely made and it cannot be identified with any particular kingdom. Yuan Chwang tells us that Sindha "had then at least three dependencies," Atien-po-chih-lo or Atyanabakela, pi-to-shih-lo (Haidarabad or Nirankoṭ) and A-fan-tu (*Brahmanabad or the Khairpur territory*). These territories were under Sindha.[144] The Chinese pilgrim gives us an imperssion that these depen-

140. *EHI., 4th Ed., P.* 349.
141. *CA., P.* 98.; *Ep. Ind, I, P.* 69.; *Ibid., Vol. XVIII, P.* 92.
142. *HCK, Canto* 4, *notes P.* 5.
143. *Ibid., P.* 5.
144. *Watters, II, Pp.* 251, 258-59; *Beal, II,* 271-280.

dencies did not enjoy political stability. The events after the death of Prabhākaravardhana support the impression left by the pilgrim and it is quite probable that Prabhākaravardhana must have utilized the unstable political conditions and must have extended his sway over Sindha.

6. *EXPEDITION AGAINST THE LĀṬAS*

According to Bühler they were the "Gurjaras of Bharocha who, no doubt, assisted their northern clansmen.[145] Dr. Raychaudhary, however, indicates that the Lāṭas may have reference to the Kaṭachuris who finally ousted Guptas from Vidisā in or about A.D. 608.[146] According to Vatsyāyana, the Lāṭa country represented the land between Tāpti and Māhī rivers to the West of Mālvā.[147] But the Aihole inscription informs us that the Lāṭas, the Mālvās and the Gurjaras were subdued by Pulakeśin II.[148] This may suggest that during the difficult days of the Puṣpabhūtis these kingdoms might have thrown off their allegiance to Prabhākaravardhana and Harṣa and might have shifted their allegiance to Pulakeśin II. Ravikīrti, however, may not be taken seriously. Even if we accept his claim, Harṣa reconquered these kingdoms.

A word must be said about Yaśovatī and her ancestry. Dr. Hoernle has assumed that Prabhākaravardhana's wife Yaśovatī was the daughter of Yaśodharmana and sister of Śīlāditya of Mālvā.[149] At the very outset we can say that there is nothing at our disposal to support Hoernle's view. Bāṇa tells us that "Yaśovatī's brother "presented his son, a boy of about

---

145. *Ibid., Vol. I, P.* 69*; CA., P.* 98*, footnote* 2.

146. *PHAI., 6th Ed., Pp.* 606-7*, Footnote* 2. *Dubreuil also maintains that Kaṭachuri (Kalachuri) dominions included the Lāṭa country in the later part of the* 6*th and the first decade of the seventh century A.D.. Ancient History of Deccan, P.* 32.*, cited in PHAI., Pp.* 606-7*, Footnote* 2.

147. *Bom. Gaz., Vol. I, Part I. P.* 7.*; Anc. Hist. of Saurāṣṭra, P.* 49.

148. *Ep. Ind., Vol. VI, Pp.* 9-10.

149. *JRAS.,* 1903*, P.* 545*f.; Mookerji, Harṣa, P.* 61.

eight years of age, to serve the young princes.[150] But he does not tell us who was this brother of the queen Yaśovatī. Neither in Harṣacharita nor in any record of Harṣa we know of any relationship of Prabhākarāvardhana with Śīlāditya of Mālvā (?). Bāṇa, who talks of Bhāṇḍī, a boy of eight, at a great length; but, to our surpirse, he does not find it proper to mention his father's name . Had he been the ruler of Mālvā, Bāṇa would not have left him unmentioned. Yaśovatī, too, while preparing to burn herself unwidowed, simply tells us that she was "the lady of a great house, born of a stainless ancestry.[151] It also becomes almost certain from her statement that her parents were alive when she decided to burn herself. Bāṇa tells us that she recalled to her mind[152] from the days of her birth all the childish experiences.[153] She cried, "Mother, father ! look not upon me as a sinner that in my sore affliction I have set out for the other world."[154] Had her father been in possession of a kingdom, she would have referred to him. All these factors lead us to conclude that Yaśovatī's father was of a good and respectable family, but his political status was not so great as assumed by Hoernle. He must have been "a mere sāmanta" as opined by Shri Vaidya.[155] The course of events, that followed the death of king Prabhākaravardhana and Rājyavardhana, and Bhāṇḍi attacking Śilāditya (*his own father* ?), and presenting to Harṣa "the family and dependents enchained, and the treasures and even the throne of his own father (?),"[156] makes it easy for us to give up Hoernle's conclusion as mere basseless assumptions.

---

150. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 116.

151. *Ibid.*, *P.* 153. 'कुलकलत्रमस्मि चारित्रमात्रधना वमंधवल कुलेजाता"
—हृ० च०, पं० उच्छ०, पृ० ३० ॥

152. *This also at the time of decision to die. HCCTH.*, *P.* 152.

153. 'स्मरन्ती प्रसुतस्तनी प्रसवदिवसादारम्य सकलमंशायिनः शैशवमस्य ज्ञातिगृंहगत हृदया' ॥ —हृ० च०, पं० उच्छ०, पृ० ३० ।

154. 'अम्ब, तात, न पश्यतं पापां परलोकप्रस्थितां मामेवमतिदुःखिताम्
—हृ० च०, पं० उच्छ०, पृ० ३० ।

155. *HMHI.*, *Vol. I*, *P.* 38.

156. *Ibid.*, *Pp.* 38-39.

Thus we can conclude that Prabhākaravardhana was the first ruler in the dynasty of the Puṣpabhūtis who can rightly be called the real founder of Puṣpabhūti hegemony with complete independent status. His achievements of having conquered the Hūṇas, the kings of Sindhu, the Gurjaras, the lord of the Gāndhāras, the Lāṭas and the Mālavās are not merely conventional praises. By these conquests and others he appears to have attained "the position of an emperor" as opined by Dr. Mookerji and thus he left for Harṣa a great kingdom with solid foundations.

CHAPTER III

BIRTH AND EARLY LIFE OF HARṢA

The king Prabhākaravardhana and his wife Yaśovatī (*Yāśomatī*)[1] led a very happy conjugal life. As an ideal Indian couple they are compared with 'Śaṅkara and Pārvatī' Viṣṇu and Lakṣhmī, Chandramā and Rohiṇī, Prajāpatī and Buddhi, and Vaśiṣtha and Arundhatī.[2]

From detailed accounts of Bāṇa it appears that they had no issue for long after marriage.[3] The king was worried for his successor and he prayed to his family deity Śiva. And it is for getting an issue the king performed daily prayers with a strict routine. Bāṇa tells us, "Day by day at sunrise he bathed, arrayed himself in white silk, wrapt his head in a white cloth, and kneeling eastwards upon the ground in a circle smeared with saffron paste, presented for an offering a bunch of red lotuses set in a pure vessel of ruby and tinged, like his own heart, with the sun's hue. Solemnly at dawn, at midday, and at eve he muttered a prayer for offspring, humbly with earnest heart repeating a hymn having the sun as its centre.[4]

---

1. *Bāṇa gives her name as Yaśovatī whereas the Banskhera and Madhubana inscriptions and the Sonpat seal refer to her as Yaśomatīdevī. As Harṣa's own records (Svahasto) refer to her as Yaśomatī, it is better to adopt both names as correct.*

2. पार्वतीव शंकरस्य, लक्ष्मीरिव लोकगुरोः, रोहणीव कलावतः, बुद्धिरिव प्रजापते, अरून्धतीव महामुने। ह० च०, चतु० उ०, पृ० २॥
HCCTH., *Pp.* 102-3.

3. *This is also confirmed if we take into consideration the age of Prabhākaravardhana and his children and the difference therein.*

4. प्रतिदिनमुदये दिनकृतः स्नातः सितदुकूलधारी धवलकर्पटप्रावृतशिराः प्राङ्मुख क्षितौ जानुभ्यां स्थित्वा कुंकुमपङ्कानुलिप्ते मण्डलके पवित्रपद्मरागपात्रीनिहितेन स्वहृदयेनेव सूर्यानुरक्तेन रक्तकमलषण्डार्चां ददौ अजपंच जप्यं सुचरितः प्रत्युषसि मध्यन्दिने दिनान्ते चापत्यहेतोः प्राष्वं प्रयतेन मनसा जंजपूको मन्त्रमादित्यहृदयम्। ह० च०, चतु० उ०, पृ० ३।
HCCTH., *P.* 104. *Similar penances for son are in the Kādambarī of Bāṇa.*

These prayers bore fruits and "one night when the night was near its close and it was just the approach of dawn" the queen had a dream in which she saw "....two shining youths issue from the sun's disk (*savturmaṇḍalannirgatya dau Kumārakau tejomayau*) accompanied by (*anugamyamānau*) one maid like a moon incarnate (*Kanyayaikayācha-chandramūrtyaiva*) lighted upon the earth (*kṣititalamavatīrṇau*) and cut open her womb with a sword (*śastreṇodaraṁ vidārya*) and essayed to enter (*praveṣṭumārabdhau*)." When she related the whole dream to the king the latter rightly understood the prophetic meaningfulness of the dream and he said to the queen, "Your parents' prayers are answered. Our wishes are fulfilled. Our family goddesses have accepted you. In his graciousness the holy god of the radiant (*the sun*) will grant you joy, and that soon, by the gift of three noble children."[6] Then, he "performed the customary ceremonies."[7] After the lapse of a short period of time the eldest prince Rājyavardhana was born.[8]

BIRTH OF HARṢA

We are certainly indebted to Bāṇa for elaborate details pertaining to Harṣa. About his birth, too, he gives all minute details since he came into womb of Yaśomatī but he, unfortunately, does not give the year of birth. He writes, "A second period having elapsed, in the Nabhas month of plantains,[9]

---

5. *HCCTH., P.* 104; ह० च०, चतु० उच्छ०, पृ० ३। *The dream at the close of the night are believed to bear fruits.*

6. *HCCTH.*, p. 106. समृद्धास्ते गुरुजनाशिषः पूर्णा नो मनोरथाः परिगृहीतासि कुलदेवताभिः प्रसन्नस्ते भगवानंशुमाली नचिरेणैवातिगुणवदपत्यत्रयलाभेनानन्दयिष्यति भवतीम् —ह० च०, च० उ०, पृ० ४।

7. *Ibid., P.* 106.

8. *Ibid., Pp.* 106-7.

9. *According to the learned editors "the plantain flowers all the year, but especially in the rains." They take it as the month of "Śrāvaṇa" HCCTH., P.* 108. *It is said that "wild plaintain plants grow up spontaneously in rainy season." HCK., Notes on 4th Canto. P.* 19. *The month of Nabhas is śrāvaṇa. HCCTH., P.* 108, *Footnote* 1.

when the bud is on the Kadamba tree,[10] the barley blades grow in clusters,[11] the red-lotus stands erect,[12] the chātaka's heart expands,[13] and the dwellers in Mānasa (Haṁsāḥ) are dumb,[14] in that month Harṣa came into being, at once in the heart and womb of Yaśovatī, even as Kriṣṇa in Devakī[15]."

According to Bāṇa, Harṣa was born "in the month of Jyeṣṭha on the twelfth day of the dark fortnight, the Pleiads being in the ascendant, just after the twilight time, when the young night had begun to climb, a sudden cry of women arose in the harem."[16] Suyātrā, daughter of Yaśomatī's nurse, conveyed this news hurriedly to the king with the following words "Good news, Your Majesty. You are blessed with the birth of a second son."[17]

---

10. *"The Kadamba tree is said to put forth buds at the advent of the thunders and rain." HCK., 4th Canto, P.* 19.

11. *HCCTH., P.* 108; "मल्लवाम्भः प्रविघूतसिक्ता कदम्बयष्टि स्फुटकोरकेव" —उत्तर रामचरित, अध्याय ३। ह० च०, च० उ०, पृ० ५।

12. *This again takes place when ponds are full of water.*

13. *It is a traditional belief that chātaka does not drink water on the earth and only takes the drops from the clouds.*

14. *It is also commonly known that Haṁsas leave for the lake of Mānsarovara when the rainy season starts and, therefore, it was probably they had left the land and their voice could not be heard.*

15. अथान्यस्मिन्नतिक्रान्ते कस्मिश्चित्काले कन्दलिनि कुड्मलितकदम्बतरौ रूढ़तोक्मतृणस्तम्बे स्तम्भिततामरसे विकसितचातकचेतसि मूकमानसौकसि नभसि मासि देव्या देवक्या इव चक्रपाणिर्यशोमत्या हृदये गर्भे च सममेव सम्बभूव हर्षः। ह० च०, च० उ०, पृ० ५। *Kriṣṇa was born on the* 8*th day of the dark fortnight of Bhādrapada, and not in Śrāvaṇa. If it is calculated on the basis of his birth the conception might have taken place in the month of Bhādrapada.*

16. ततश्च प्राप्ते ज्येष्ठामलीये मासि बहुलासु बहुलपक्षद्वादश्यां व्यतीते प्रदोषसमये समाकस्मात् चाक्रायामवक्रे अन्तःपुरे समुदपादि कोलाहलः स्त्रीजनस्य। हर्ष०, पृ० ६। *HCK., 4th Canto, P.* 6, *HCCTH., P.* 109.

17. देव, दिष्टया वर्धसे द्वितीयसुतजन्मना। ह० च०, च० उ०, पृ० ६। *HCK., 4th Canto, P.* 6, *HCCTH. P.* 109. *About this date Shri C. V. Vaidya says "Being given by a person who was himself at the court of Harṣa these data may be looked upon as reliable". HMHI., Vol. I, P.* 41.

Bāṇa, who is so much particular about the time and position of the planets and other details, unfortunately does not mention the day and the year. This omission and the faulty astronomical calculations of Bāṇa have made the confusion worse confounded. He says, "Harṣa was born in the month of Jyeṣṭha on the twelfth day of the dark fortnight when the moon was entering on her youth." We can fix it at about 10 p.m. It was the time of 'Pradoṣa'. Shri C.V. Vaidya, after a detailed calculaion made on the basis of these data as studied and discussed by Prof. Apte of the Victoria College, Laskar (*Gwalior*), has made an accurate study of Harṣa's birth date. Prof. Apte maintains That "The moon was at 10 p. m. in the Kṛittikās on the 12th of Jyeṣṭha Vadya Śaka 511, (589 A.D.) as also on the 12th of Jyeṣṭha Vadya Śaka 512 (590 A.D.)". According to the learned scholar, the latter year seems more probable of the two, as in the former the dvādaśī set in after sunrise" and "The month mentioned by Bāṇa must here be taken to be an Amānta month."[18] Only by that calculation (*Amānta month*) we can fix Harṣa's birth on the 12th day of Jyeṣṭha Vadya, Śaka 512.[19]

In order to fix up the corresponding date according to English calendar, Shri Vaidya, on the basis of calculations from Śewell and Dexit's tables, has found that the moon in Kṛittikā and Dvādaśī come together in the Jyeṣṭha Vadya in the years 511 and 512. Prof. Vaidya says the year 512 is better and more correct for "There is dvādaśī from sunrise and the tithi lasts for more than 22 hours" and the Kṛittikā nakṣatra begins after four hours after sunrise." Thus the Śaka year 512 suits all conditions and requirements necessary to corroborate Bāṇa's statement.

---

18. *Month ending with the Amāvaśyā. According to Shri Apte, "this seems somewhat strange as Bāṇa, who was a northener, does not use the northen calculations with the Purṇimānta month; i.e. the month ending with the Pūrṇimā (on the full moon day). This may probably be due to Śaka era's influence. If we take Pūrṇimānta month we have to accept Vaiśākha Vadya* 12, *but we do not find the moon in Kṛittikā neither on Vadya* 12, 588, *nor* 589, *nor Vadya* 590, *nor* 591. *HMHI., Vol. I, Pp.* 42-3.

19. *Ibid., Pp.* 42*f.*

The Jyeṣṭha Vadya 12, Śaka 512, according to Sewell and Dexit's table corresponds to Sunday, the 4th June, 590. A.D.,[20]

Another point of confusion that has been made by Bāṇa is about the planetary conditions. Bāṇa puts it in the mouth of an astrologer who says that "It was on a day like this, free from the taint of all evil conjunctions such as malignant aspects of the sun and the moon, at the moment like the present, when all the planets were similarly at their apexes, that Māndhātrī came to earth."[21]

This statement is also erroneous as neither in 589 nor in 590 on Jyeṣṭha Vaidya 12 all the planets were in their uchcha or at their apexes. . . .[22] "Perhaps", says Vaidya, "this was the exaggeration of the court astrologer, (probably deliberate), or some one else. When Harṣa was born, his future greatness was not known," and "When his subsequent greatness entitled him to a good horoscope was one nanufactured by the court astrologer."[23] Very soon, Tāraka, an astrologer,[24] who was highly este-

---

20. *Ibid.*, *P.* 43.

21. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 112. मान्धाता किलैवंविधे व्यतीपातादिसर्वदोषाभिष रहिते हनि सर्वेषूच्चस्थानस्थितेष्वेवं ग्रहेष्वीदृशि लग्ने भेजे जन्म । ह० च०, च० उच्छ०, पृ० ६ ।

22. मेष, वृषभ, मकर, कन्या, कर्क, मीन *and* तुला *are the* उच्च *s respectively of* रवि, चन्द्र, भौम, बुध, गुरु, शुक्र *and* शनि ।

Kane opines that "it seems impossible from an astrological point of view that the all planets were in their exaltation at the time of Harṣa's birth. The day being the 12*th Jyeṣṭha Vadya, the sun could not have been in 'Mesa' which is the 'uchcha' of the sun (Ravi)". HCK., Notes,* 4*th Canto,* *P.* 24.

23. *HMHI.*, *I*, *P.* 42. *Vaidya says further, "Although from the above, Bāṇa's testimony regarding the position of the planets is found to be unreliable, his date of birth cannot be so as Harṣa's birth day celebrations must have taken place every year as emperor's birth days usually are and there could have been no mistake about it". Ibid.*, *P.* 42.

24. परमसंमतः शलक्षः संवादितातीन्द्रियादेशो दर्शितप्रभावः स लिती ज्योतिषि सर्वासां ग्रहसंहितानां पारदृश्वा सकलगणमकमध्ये महितो हितश्च त्रिकालज्ञानभाग्भोजकस्तारको नाम गणकः । ह० च०, च० उच्छ०, पृ० ६ ।

emed for supernatural insight and great mastery on all the treatises on astronomy, came and prophecied the greatness of the future that Harṣa was destined to achieve.[25]

Harṣa's birth was celebrated with great pomp and show and we mark many common customs being observed on that occasion. White-clad (*śukla vāsavo*) Brāhmaṇas, with the Vedas on their lips (*Brahmamukhāḥ*)[26] to foster (*vṛidhaye*) the newborn's life. The family priest came with lustre and fruits ready in his hand (*śāntyudakaphalahastasthau*) along with the incoming elders of the family (*Bāndhavavṛiddhāḥ*). In accordance with the time-honoured custom the prisoners were freed "whose disorderly crowds" (*muktāni bandhanavṛindāni*) are described by Bāṇa.[27]

The festivities at the royal palace are presented in a somewhat magniloquent style, "So proceeded the great birth festival, the order of the royal household gone, the pretence of chamberlains laid low, the macebearers robbed of their maces, entrances to the harem in no wise criminal, master and servants reduced to a level, young and old confounded, learned and unlearned on one footing, drunk and sober not to be distinguished, noble maidens and harlots equally merry, the whole population of the capital set a-dancing."[28]

From Bāṇa's statement it appears that the gap between Rājyavardhana and Harṣa was of about 5 years. He says, "When Rājyavardhana was now nearing his sixth year (*ṣaṣṭhaṁ varṣamavatarati cha Rājyavardhane*) and while Harṣa could just manage five or six paces with the support of his nurse's finger (*dhātrikarāṅgulilagne pañcha ṣāṇi padāni*

25. *Ibid., P.* 110.

26. *Ibid., P.* 111, *or it may mean "headed by Brahma." Ibid., P.* 111, *Footnote* 1.

27. *Prisoners were released on such occasions. This we learn from many ancient treatises.*

28. *HCCTH., P.* 111; प्रावर्तत च विगतराजकुलस्थितिरथ: कृतप्रतीहाराकुलि-रपनीतवेत्रिवत्रो निर्दोषान्त:पुरप्रवेश: समस्वामिपरिजनो निर्विशेष बालवृद्धः समानशिष्टाशिष्टजनो दुर्ज्ञेयमत्तामत्तप्रविभागस्तुल्यकुलयुवतिवेश्यालापविलास: प्रनृत्तसकलकटकलोक: पुत्रजन्मोत्सवो महान्। ह० च०, च० उच्छ्०, पृ० ७।

prayachchhati Harṣe), it was at that time queen Yaśomatī became pregnent with Rājyaśrī" (*Devī Yaśomatī garbheṇādhatta Devīṁ Rājyaśriyaṁ*).[29] Thus the difference between the age of Harṣa and that of Rājyaśrī must have been of nearly two years or a little less than two years. It was about the time of Rājyaśrī's birth Yaśomatī's brother presented his son Bhaṇḍī, a boy of about eight years of age, to serve the young princes.[30] He is the same Bhaṇḍī who helped these princes with unqualified loyality and devotion in their hour of need.

HARṢA'S EARLY LIFE AND EDUCATION

Bāṇa does not give necessary details pertaining to Harṣa's early life and education. He simply says, generally speaking, about the princes Rājyavardhana, Harṣa and princess Rājyaśrī alongwith their fourth brother Bhaṇḍi that "growing in due course step by step" (*Krameṇa vardhamānau*) "they came to manhood" (*Yauvanamavataretuḥ*).[31] But no specific mention has been made with regard to their education and training. From the informations found here and there in Harṣacharita and his other work Kādambarī Bāṇa makes it quite clear that people educated their children with adequate care and a great sense of responsibility. From the description we find in Bāṇa's works we can assume that Harṣa's educational career might have started at about 6 or 7 and continued up to the age of fourteen.[32] We definitely know that Harṣa assumed full control

---

29. *HCCTH.*, *Pp.* 115-16. ह० च०, च० उच्छ०, पृ० ९-१०।

30. *Ibid.*, *Pp.* 116. अस्मिन्नेव तु काल देव्या यशोमत्या भ्राता सुतमष्टवर्षदेशीयमुह्यमानकुटिलकाकपक्षकशिखण्ड कुमारयोरर्पितवान। ह० च०, च० उच्छ०, पृ० १०। *Thus Bhaṇḍi was elder to Harṣa by nearly six years and to Rājyavardhana by two years.*

31. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 117; ह० च०, च० उच्छ०, पृ० १०।

32. *Bāṇa himself performed all his sacred duties proper to a Brāhmaṇa as enjoyed in Śruti and Smṛiti by his fourteenth year.* कृतोपनयनादिक्रियाकलापस्य समावृत्तस्य चतुर्दशवर्षदेशीयस्य पितापि श्रुतिस्मृतिविहितं कृत्वा द्विजजनोचितं निखिलं पुण्यजातं कालेनादशमीस्य एवास्तमगात्। ह० च०, प्र० उ०, पृ० ११। *HCCTH.*, *P.* 32. *This, probably also applied to princes as we learn that prince*

of the affairs of the kingdom when he was about sixteen years of age. It appears that due emphasis was laid on physical and military education of Harṣa and Rājyavardhana. They rode on horses and had well-proportioned bodies.[33] They rode the best of elephants.[34] Bāṇa says that "day after day their hands, begrimed with the marks of sword play, seemed defiled by quenching the fire of all other monarchs' prowess. By the deep twang of their bows at recreation time they seemed conversing after recent dalliance with the queens of the quarters."[35] This clearly proves that both Rājyavardhana and Harṣa were trained in the sword-fighting and bow-fighting. It appears that in bow-fighting they attained great skill. Bāṇa says, "The very bow borne by the clouds distressed their

---

Chandrapīḍa is said to have entered the school when he was six and studied for ten years. Thus he left the school when he was sixteen. Yuan Chwang also gives the same information. He tells us that "when the children are seven years of age the great treatises of the Five sciences are gradually communicated to them." *Watters, I, P.* 154-5.

33. अरुणगरुडाविव हरिवाहनविभक्तशरीरौ। हृ० च०, च० उच्छ०, पृ० १०। *Both Hari and Harivāhan mean horse of a special breed and Aruṇa is charioteer of the sun and Garuḍa is the Vāhana of Viṣṇu. It may indicate that they drove with speed of Aruṇa and Garuḍa on the horses assigned for carrying Sūrya and Viṣṇu. Kane appears to adopt similar meaning. Notes, HCK., P.* 40.; *HCCTH., P.* 117; *Monier Williams, Pp.* 1289 *and* 1290.

34. इन्द्रोपेन्द्राविव नागेन्द्रगतौ। *It may also mean "their gait was like that of the best of elephants." But both Indra and Viṣṇu ride on Nāgendra. Indra has his Erāvata, the best of elephants, and Viṣṇu is also known as Śeṣaśāyī i.e. one who sleeps on the "śeṣa", the lord of the serpents. HCCTH., P.* 117.

35. *HCCTH., P.* 118. अनुदिवसं शास्त्राभ्यासश्यामिकाकलङ्कितमशेषराजकप्रतापाग्निनिर्वापणमलिनमिव करतलमुद्वहन्तौ, योग्याकालेषु धीरैर्धनुर्ध्वनिभिरभ्यणोपभोगाद्दिग्वधूभिरिवालपन्तौ। हृ० च०, च० उच्छ०, पृ० १९।
This may indicate the tawing of their bows spread in all directions. In Himālayas .... "He with his bow drawn to the ear killed wild creatures." HCCTH., P. 132.
चाकर्णान्ताकृष्टकार्मुकनिर्गततासुरभल्लवर्षी स्वल्पीयोभिरेव दिवसैर्निः श्वापदान्यरण्यानि। हृ० च, पं० उ०, पृ० १२।

hearts."[36] Our knowledge of education imparted to the princes in Bāṇa's times is further supplemented by his description of education and training given to prince Chandrapīḍa. An elaborate picture has been drawn by Bāṇa and to understand the essentiality of education for princes or heir-apparents, Kādambarī works as a mirror. Bāṇa says that almost all branches of learning and all sciences were taught to prince Chandrapīḍa.

He is said to have attained a high degree of perfection and masterly skill in words (*pade*),[37] sentences (*vākye*),[38] in reasoning or logic (*pramāṇe*), in theology (*dharmaśāstre*), in polity (*rājanīti*), in Gymnastics (*Vyāyāmavidyāsu*), in all kinds of weapons, such as the bow (*chāpa*), quoit (*chakra*), shield (*charma*), scimitar (*kṛipāṇa*), dart (*śakti*), mace (*tomara*), battle-axe (*parśu*), and club (*gadā*), in driving and elephant-riding (*gajapṛiṣṭheṣu*) and in chariotdriving (*rathacharyāsu*); in musical instruments, such as the lute (*Vīṇā*), fife (*veṇu*) etc.; in the laws of dancing (*nṛityaśāstreṣu*) and in the science of music (*Gandharvavedaviśeṣu*). He attained complete skill in the management of elephants, the knowledge of horses and the marks of men (*puruṣalakṣane*);[39] he was trained in the arts of painting (*chitrakarmāṇi*), leaf-cutting (*patrachchedye*), the use of books (*pustakavyāpāra*); he was also taught all the arts of gambling and had acquired the knowledge of the cries of birds and had learned astronomy (*grahagaṇite*). He gained the knowledge of testing the jewels (*ratnaparīkṣā*) and learned carpentry (*dārukarmāṇi*), the art of ivory (*dantavyāpāre*), architecture (*vāstuvidyāsu*), the science of medicine (*Āyurveda*), mechanics (*yantraprayoga*), antidotes (*Viśapaharaṇa*), the science of tunnels (*sura-*

36. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 118; जलधरधृतेनापि धनुषा दोद्रूयमानहृदयौ। हु० च०, ४, ११।

37. *It may be lexicography.*

38. *It may indicate grammar or philology.*

39. *Bāṇa informs us that the right hand of Divākaramitra was graced with all the lines and marks of a great man. HCCTH., P. 238. Harṣa is also said to have possessed the auspicious marks which told of his sovereignty. Ibid., P. 91. These examples prove that a special branch of science of the study of such marks was in existence.*

ṅgopabheda), swimming, magic (*indrajāla*), stories (*kathāsu*), dramas, romances (*ākhyāyikā*), poetry (*Kāvyeṣu*); he thoroughly studied the Mahābhārata, the Rāmāyaṇa, the Purāṇas and history; he learnt all kinds of writing (*lipi,u*), and all languages of all the countries, all technicalities (*sarvasanjñāṣu*), all mechanical arts (*sarvaśilpeṣu*), metre (*chhandeṣu*) and other various branches of arts.[40]

This long list is admittedly exaggerated and it is quite obvious that a man cannot attain "the highest skill" in all these branches even if he devotes the whole of his life. But this exaggerated account, however, reveals the existence of these various branches of learning. Harṣa must have been taught some of these subjects in order to be trained for the great task. Bāṇa tells us that Prabhākaravardhana was conscious about his responsibility. We learn that he educated Rājyaśrī. Harṣa also proves his literary knowledge and his works are the testimony in themselves. It was their thorough educational training that made Rājyavardhana and Harṣa well-trained for the task assigned to them. It is clear from the conversation between Prabhākaravardhana and his sons. He says, "It is difficult to secure good servants, the first essential of sovereignty. In general mean persons, making themselves congenial, like atoms, in combination, compose the substance of royalty. Fools, setting people to dance in the intoxication of their play, make peacocks of them. Knaves, working their way in, reproduce as in a mirror their own image. Like dreams, impostors by false phantasies beget unsound views. By songs, dances, and jests unwatched flatterers, like neglected diseases of the humours, bring on madness. Like thirsty catakas, low-born persons cannot be held fast. Cheats, like fishermen, hook the purpose at its first rise in the mind, like a fish in Mānasa. Like those who depict infernos, loud singers paint unrealities on the canvas of the air. Suitors, more keen than arrows, plant a barb in the heart. For these reasons I have appointed to wait upon your highnesses the brothers Kumāragupta and Mādhavagupta, sons of the Mālva king, inseparable as my arms from my side, they are men found by frequent trials untouched by any taint of vice, blameless discreet,

40. *Kādambari, tr. Ridding, P.* 60; *Kādambari, Ed. Parab, Pp.* 168-169.

strong, and comely. To them your highnesses also will show a consideration not enjoyed by the rest of your dependants."[41]

This somewhat lengthy passage shows that Prabhākaravardhana trained both these princes in the art of government and they were up to his expectation which was amply justified by their handling the situation after their father's death.

HARṢA'S EARLY MILITARY CAREER

In ancient times it was a common practice that the princees had to participate in the military engagements alongwith their fathers. We know it for certain that many princes fought some important battles before coming to throne.[42] But about Harṣa's early military career we do not possess such information. From Bāṇa's Harṣacharita we learn that soon after the marriage of Rājyaśrī, king Prabhākaravardhana, one day summoned Rājyavardhana to lead an expedition against the Hūṇas. We are told that he was a grown-up youth and "was fitted himself for wearing armour (*Kavacha*). He was placed at the head of an immense force" and was sent "attended by ancient advisers and devoted feudatories towards the north to attack the Hūṇas."[43] Bāṇa hastens to tell us that Harṣa "followed

---

41. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 119. प्रथमं राज्यांग दुर्लभाः सभृत्याः। प्रायेण परमाणव इव समवायेष्वनुगुणीभूय द्रव्यं कुर्वन्ति पार्थिवं क्षुद्राः। क्रीडारसेन नर्तयन्तो मयूरतां नयन्ति बालिशाः। दर्पणमिवानुप्रविश्यात्मीयां प्रकृतिं संक्रामयन्ति पल्लविकाः। स्वप्ना इव मिथ्यादर्शनैरसद्बुद्धिं जनयन्ति विप्रलम्भकाः। गीतनृत्यहसितैरुन्मत्ततामावहन्त्युपेक्षिता विकारा इव वातिकाः। चातका इव तृष्णावन्तो न शक्यन्ते ग्रहीतुमकुलीनाः। मानसे मीनमिव स्फुरन्तमेवाभिप्रायं गृह्णन्ति जालिकाः। यमपट्टिका इवाम्बरे चित्रमालिखन्त्युद्गीतकाः। शल्यं हृदये निक्षिपन्तिमार्मणाः। यतः सर्वदोषाभिष्वङ्गैरसङ्गतौ बहुधोपधाभिः परीक्षितौ शुची विनीतौ विक्रान्तावभिरूपौ मालवराजपुत्रौ भ्रातरौ भुजाविव मे शरीरादव्यतिरिक्तौ कुमारगुप्तमाधवगुप्तनामानांवस्माभिर्भवतोरनुचरत्वार्थमिमौ निर्दिष्टौ, अनयोरूपरिभुवम्यामपिनान्यपरिजनसमवृत्तिभ्यां भवितव्यम्।—ह० च०, च० उच्छ०, पृ० ११।

42. *There are many examples of such nature and they are widely known.*

43. *HCCTH.*, *Pp.* 132*f.* राज्यवर्धनं कवचहरमाहूय हूणान्हन्तुं हरिणानिव हरिर्हरिणेशकिशोरकमपरिमितबलानुयातं चिरन्तनरमात्यैरनुरक्तैश्च महासामन्तैः कृत्वा साभिसरमुत्तरापथं प्राहिणोत्।—ह० च०, पं० उच्छ०, पृ० १९।

his march with the horse for several stages."[44] When Rājyavardhana "had entered the snowy regions", Harṣa is said to have "spent several days, for his being at adventure-loving age, away from the camp where he got an opportunity to hunt lions sarabhas, tigers and boars which were in plentiful". He is said to have "left the forest empty of those wild creatures in comparatively few days." This is all what Bāṇa says about Harṣa's early military career.

This was not, as Bāṇa suggests, merely an offensive war which Rājyavardhana waged. It was both an offensive and defensive war against the Hūṇas. It was a serious engagement as we shall see later. And Harṣa's participation in that expedition makes it clear that Harṣa was well-trained for the war and was allowed to go in order to have practical training in active military operations.

Harṣa spent these several days at the military camp. It can be safely assumed that Harṣa was entrusted with the task of guarding the rear, while Rājyavardhana was engaged in a serious struggle against the Hūṇas. Bāṇa does not record the details of this conflict, but the description of Prince Rājyavardhana and his expedition clearly indicates the seriousness of the engagement. He says "The eleder brother came in sight amid a throng of servants pale and worn with many days' neglect of bathing, eating and sleeping, and reduced in numbers by their long rapid march." He adds "Only one or two, chiefly domestics, could be distinguished. The umbrella-bearer was wanting, the superintendent of the wardrobe lagged behind, the pitcher carrier had collapsed, the spittoon-bearer was prostrate, the betel-bearer panted, and the sword-bearer limped" and "the earth had made him her refuge."[45]

---

44. *HCCTH., P.* 132 प्रयान्तं च तं देवो हर्षः कतिचित्प्रयाणकानि तुरङ्गमैरनुवव्राज। हृ० च०, पं० उच्छ०, पृ० १९।

45. *HCCTH., P.* 165. दूरद्रुतागमनमुषिबाहुल्येन विच्छिन्नच्छत्रधारेण लम्बिताम्बरवाहिना भ्रष्टभृङ्गारग्राहिणा च्युताचमनधारिणा चाम्यत्ताम्बूलिकेन खंजत्खड्गग्राहिणा कतिपयप्रकाशदासेरकप्रायेण बहुवासरान्तरितस्नानभोजनशयनश्यामक्षामवपुषा परिजनेन परिवृतम्, अविरलमार्गधूलिधूसरितशरीरतया शरणीकृतमिवाशरणया क्षमागतया वसुन्धरया। —हृ० च०, षष्ठ उच्छ०, पृ० ३६।

This description of Rājyavardhana's return, of course, coincides with the sad demise of Prabhākaravardhana and Bāṇa intends to portray Rājyavardhana's condition because of the grief he felt at the news; but what he writes further is a clear testimony to what happened during the struggle against Hūṇas. Bāṇa says that his body was "dotted with long white bandages bound about arrow wounds received in battle while conquering the Hūṇas."[46] Though a victory, if Bāṇa is believed, it was a serious engagement and Rājyavardhana fought it courageously. On the occasion of such great danger and stubborn resistence offered by Rājyavardhana, the latter might have posted Harṣa to guard the rear, which he appears to have performed quite skilfully.

FAVOURITE SON

From Harṣacharita it appears that Harṣa enjoyed his father's affection more than his elder brother Rājyavardhana. The first hint of such treatment is felt when the king fell ill. We are told by Bāṇa that the message was first conveyed to Harṣa through a special messenger named Kuraṅgaka. As the latter does not mention any desire of conveying the news of king's illness to his eleder brother, Rājyavardhana, it is quite obvious that the king must have asked the messenger to convey the message only to Harṣa. When Harṣa reached the bed of his father, the latter received him with so great affection [7] that we are forced to conclude that his father loved him most.[48] Bāṇa's pen gives a very fine picture of this meeting of a father on the sick-bed with a son whom he loved so much. He tells us, "Limb pressed to limb; cheek joined to cheek; closing eyes which flowed with incessant drops forming on their lashes he held his son in a long embrace, foregetting all the torments of the fever."[49] When

46. *HCCTH., P.* 165. हूणनिर्जयसमरशरव्रणबद्धपट्टकदीर्घधवलः । —ह० च०, ष० उच्छ०, पृ० ३६।

47. *HCCTH., PP.* 141*ff.*

48. *Ibid., Pp.* 147*ff.*

49. *HCCTH.*, 142. कपोलेन कपोलमवषट्टयन्, निमीलयन्पक्ष्माग्रग्रथिताजस्रास्रविस्राविणी बिलोचने विस्मृतज्वरसंज्वरः ।—ह० च०, पं० उच्छ०, पृ० २४।

he sat down near the couch, his father "gazed upon him with eyes that seemed to drink him in their fixed unblinking look."[50] And again and again he "touched him with trembling palms." This description certainly amounts to the strongest bonds of love. Later the king, after a long sigh said in "tear-chocked accents" (*bāṣpavegagrihyamāṇākṣaraṁ*), "I know your filial love and exceeding tender heart. At times like this overmastering, all-afflicting family affection distracts even a sober man's mind. For this reason you must not give yourself over to sorrow. Consumed as I am by the fever's fierce heat, I am still more so by your distress. Your leanness cuts me like a sharp kinfe." And then he hastens to declare, "Upon you my happiness, my sovereignty, my succession, and my life are set, and as mine, so those of all my people. The sorrows of such as you are a sorrow to all people on the earth; for no families of small worth are adorned by your like. You are the fruit of stainless deeds stored up in many another life. You bear marks declaring the sovereignty of the four oceans, one and all, to be almost in your grasp. By your mere birth my end is attained, I am free from the wish to live. Only deference to the physicians makes me drink their medicines. Furthermore, to such as you, who through the merits of a whole people are born for the protection of all the earth, fathers are a mere expedient to bring you into being. In their people, not in their kin, are kings rich in relatives. Rise therefore, and once more attend to all the needs of life."[51]

---

50. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 142; आगतमासीनं च शयनान्तिके पिबन्निव विगतनिमेष-निश्चलन चक्षुषा व्यलोकयत्। ह० च०, पं० उच्छ०, पृ० २४।

51. *HCCTH.*, *Pp.* 142-3. जानामि त्वां पितृप्रियमतिमृदुहृदयम्। ईदृशेषु विधुरयति धीमतोऽपि धियमतिदुर्धरो बान्धवस्नेह सर्वप्रमाथी यतो नार्हस्यतिमात्रमात्मानं शुचे दातुम्। उद्दामदाहज्वरदग्धोऽपि दह्ये खल्वमहधिकतरमनेनायुष्मदाधिना। निशितमिव शस्त्रं दक्ष्णोति मां त्वदीयस्तनिमा। सुखं च राज्यं च वशंश्च प्राणाश्च परलोकश्च त्वयि मे स्थिताः। यथा मम तथा सर्वासां प्रजानाम्। त्वद्विधानां पीडाः पीडयन्ति सकलमेव भुवनतलम्। न ह्यल्पपुण्यभाजां वंशमलंकुर्वन्ति भवादृशाः। फलस्यनेकजन्मान्तरोपार्जितस्याकलुषस्य कर्मणः। करतलगतमिव कथयन्ति चतुर्णामप्यर्णवानामाधिपत्यं ते लक्षणानि। त्वज्जन्मनैव कृतार्थोऽस्मि। निरभिलाषोऽस्मि जीवितव्य। भिषगनुरोधः पाययति मामौषधम्। अपि च सर्वप्रजापुण्यैःसकलभुवनतलपरिपालनार्थमुत्पत्स्यमानानां भवादृशां जन्मग्रहणोपायः पितरौ। प्रजाभिस्तु बन्धुमन्तो राजानः, न ज्ञातिभिः। तदुत्तिष्ठ। कुरु पुनरेव सर्वाः क्रियाः।—ह० च०, पं० उच्छ०, पृ० २४।

Prabhākaravardhana's illness proved most serious shock to Harṣa's mother. Queen Yaśomatī decided to enter the fire in order to die unwidowed. She did not listen to Harṣa's request and plunged into fire at Sarasvatī's bank. This shock of his mother's separation redoubled his grief and Harṣa was weeping because of this deep sorrow. The king, recovering consciousness at the sound of prince's ceaseless weeping tried to pacify him with the following words, "You should not be so, my son. Men of your mould are not infirm of heart. Strength of soul is the people's mainstay, and second to it is royal blood. With you, the vanguard of the stout-hearted, the abode of all pre-eminence, what has weakness to do ? To say you are the lamp of your line were almost depreciation of one whose brilliance compares with the god of day. To call you a lion among heroes is like a reproach to one whose prowess is seconded by penetrating insight. To declare this earth yours is almost a vain repetition, when your bodily marks proclaim an universal emperor's dignity. To bid you take to yourself glory is almost contradictory, when glory has herself adopted you. 'Succeed to this world' is a command too mean for an intending conqueror of both worlds. 'Appropriate my treasury' is a grant of little service to one whose sole craving is for the accumulation of fame spotless as moonlight. 'Make prize of the feudatory kings' is almost meaningless, when your virtues have made prize of all beings. 'Support the burden of royalty' is an injunction misbecoming one accustomed to support the burden of the three worlds. 'Protect the people' is but reiteration, when the sky has your long arm for its bar. 'Guard well your dependants' is an incidental duty to a peer of the world's Guardians. 'Practise yourself in arms', to one whose forearm is blackened by the bow-string's callous brand how can this advice be given ? 'Check levity' is an utterance without excuse towards one whose senses even in tender years were held in check. 'Annihilate your foes' is a suggestion of your own inborn valour."[52]

52. *HCCTH., Pp.* 155-56. पुत्र, नार्हस्येवं भवितुम्। भवद्विधा न ह्यमहासत्त्वाः। महासत्त्वता हि प्रथममवलम्बनं लोकस्य पश्चाद्राजबीजिता। सत्त्ववतां चाग्रणीः सर्वातिशयाश्चितः क्व भवान् क्व वैक्लव्यम्। 'कुलप्रदीपोऽसि' इति दिवसकरसदृशतेजसस्ते लघूकरणमिव। 'पुरुष सिंहोऽसि' इति शार्यपटुप्रज्ञोपबृंहितपराक्रमस्य निन्देव। 'क्षितिरियं तव' इति लक्षणाख्यातचक्र-

This great piece of advice certainly shows that Harṣa was loved more than his elder brother Rājyavardhana. On the basis os these somewhat long citations cited above, we can sum up the following points.

Firstly, Prabhākaravardhana loved Harṣa more than he loved Rājyavardhana and when the message of his sudden illness was conveyed it was meant for Harṣa alone without any reference to Rājyavardhana.

Secondly, when Harṣa returned, the king did not inquire anything about his brother Rājyavardhana who was despatched with an important mission against the Hūṇas.

Thirdly, when the king saw his end near he clearly tells Harṣa to take up the affairs of the State and the Government.

These circumstances clearly prove that the king Prābhakaravardhana favoured Harṣa to his elder brother Rājyavardhana, and, as Sir V. Smith says, a party at court (*probably including the king*)) inclined to favour the succession of the younger prince.[53] But the later part of the opinion of the learned scholar does not appear to be well-founded when he says, "But all intrigues were frustrated by the return of Rājyavardhana."[54] It is to be recalled that speedy return of Rājyavardhana was managed by Harṣa himself. As soon as the latter reached the capital following the message of king's illness he, first of all, made arrangements for his brother's quick return. Bāṇa clearly says that Harṣa, "In hot haste, dispatched

---

वर्तिपदस्य पुनरुक्तमिव। 'गृह्यतां श्रीः' इति स्वयमेव श्रिया गृहीतस्य विपरीतमिव। 'अध्यास्यतामय लोकः' इत्युभयलोकविजिगीषोरपुष्कलमिव। 'स्वीक्रियतां कोषः' इति शशिकरनिकरनिर्मलयशः संचयैकाभिनिवेशिनो निरुपयोगमिव। 'आत्मीक्रियतो राजकम्' इति गुणगणात्मीकृतजगतो गतार्थमिव। 'उह्यता राज्यभारः' इति भुवनत्रयेभारोचितस्यानुचितनियोग इव। 'प्रजाः परिरक्ष्यन्ताम्' इति दीर्घदोर्दण्डागलितदिङ्मुखस्यानुवाद इव। 'परिजनः परिपाल्यताम्' इति लोकपालोपमस्यानुषङ्गिकमिव। 'शस्त्राभ्यासः कायः' इति धनुर्गुणकिणकल कालीकृतप्रकोष्ठस्य किमादिश्यते। 'निग्राह्यतां चापलम्' इति नुतनतरवयसि निगृहीतेन्द्रियस्य निरवकाशेव वाणी। 'निरवशेषतां शत्रवो नेयाः'। —ह० च०, पं० उच्छ०, पृ० ३१-३२।

53. *EHI., 4th Ed., P. 349.*

54. *Ibid., P.* 349.

couriers and swift camel-riders one after another to procure his brother's coming."[55] This clearly shows that Harṣa was completely innocent about any secret move of the "party at court" and, probably, with a consent of the king. The statements of king Prabhākaravardhana in order to pursuade Harṣa to get his consent to accept the throne amount to his clear desire for Harṣa's succession in supercession to the legitimate claims of Rājyavardhana, who was the eldest prince and was the legal heir to the throne. The latter was away from the capital and in his absence the king, almost on his death bed, made an unambiguous statement requesting Harṣa to accept the crown. There is no mention of Rājyavardhana at all, nor we get any hint that the king was requesting Harṣa because his elder brother was away and there was no time to wait for his return.

These circumstances certainly lead us to come to a definite conclusion that the king favoured Haṣra's succession to the throne and, the court, probably knowing king's leanings for the younger prince or for his promising career, favoured this idea and they informed Harṣa alone of the king's illness. It might have been a deliberate attempt of the court to see Harṣa's peaceful succession, and it was, probably, in order to avoid unexpected and ugly controversy, they avoided the presence of the elder prince Rājyavardhana. Obviously for this reason, Harṣa alone was informed. But we cannot include Harṣa's name in this attempt. He was neither conscious nor was informed of such a move of deliberate attempt at offering the throne to him in preference to his elder brother and it is proved, beyond doubt, that Harṣa was completely innocent about it. He shows his personl concern and anxiety "to procure his brother's coming," and "he could scarce pass the time, waiting with longing heart for his brother's advent."[56] He says, "Pray heaven my brother, when he learns of our father's death, a type of the world's dissolution, may not after a bath of tears assume two robes of bark ! or seek a hermitage as a royal sage ! or, man-lion as he is, enter a mountain cave ! Though his lotus eyes brim with a flood of tears,

---

55. *HCCTH., P.* 145.

56. *HCCTH., P.* 163. चिन्तयन्दर्शनोत्सुकहृदयो भ्रातुरागमनमुदीक्षमाणः।
—हर्षं चरित, पंचम उच्छ्वास, पृ० ३५।

may he yet look upon the lordless earth ! Tormented by the poisonous pangs of a first loss, may the best of men yet remember himself ! Never may indifference due to the transitoriness of things lead him to slight the advances of sovereign glory ! All aflame with the fire of direful pain, may he have recourse to the coronation bath ! Once arrived here may he not, when pressed by the kings, display a contrary mind ! 'True, my noble brother was deeply devoted to his sire. He was for ever singing to me our father's praises."[57]

This clearly exonerates Harṣa of any possibility of his conscious participation or deliberate involvement in an attempt to secure the kingdom for himself. But the king and the court had a favourable consideration for Harṣa's succession.

---

57. *Ibid., Pp.* 162-3. "अपि नाम तातस्य मरणं सहाप्रलयसदृशमिदमुमश्रुत्य आर्यो बाष्पजलस्नातो न गृह्णीयाद्वल्कले, नाश्रयेद्वा राजर्षिराश्रमपदम् न विशेद्वा पुरुषसिंहो गिरिगुहाम् अस्त्रसलिलनिर्भरभरितयननलिनयुगलो वा पश्येदनाथां पृथिवीम्। प्रथमव्यसनविषमविषविह्वलः स्मरेदात्मानं वा पुरुषोत्तमः, अनित्यतया जनितवैराग्यो वा न निराकुर्यादुपसर्पन्तीं राज्यलक्ष्मीम्, दारूणदुःखदहनप्रज्वलितदेहो वा प्रतिपद्येताभिषेकम्' इहागतो वा राजभिरभिलषीयमानो न पराचीनतामाचरेत्। अतिपितृपक्षपाती खल्वायं: सर्वदा तातश्लाघया मामभिधत्ते"।

—ह० च, पं० उच्छ०, पृ० ३५।

The ways in which Harṣa welcomed Rājyavardhana and the latter's affection for the former do not give any impression of this kind. HCCTH., Pp. 166*ff.*

CHAPTER IV

HARṢA'S ACCSESSION TO POWER

We have seen how Prabhākaravardhana, the lion (*keśarī*) was disturbed by the Hūṇa deers (*Hūṇahariṇas*) and how he despatched Rājyavardhana and Harṣa to quell the Hūṇas. The mission was a brilliant success, but it was unfortunate that the king did not live to welcome his victorious son Rājyavardhana. It was Harṣa alone who could reach the capital and could meet his ailing father. He waited for his brother's return 'with longing anxiety.'

Time is said to be the best healer and we learn from Bāṇa that gradually (*krameṇa*) "the lamentations subsided" (*mandeṣvākrandeṣu*) "and the outcries" (*vilāpeṣu*) "became rare" (*viralībhavatsu*).[1]

RĀJYAVARDHANA RETURNS TO THE CAPITAL

One day Harṣa 'saw himself unexpetedly surrounded by a great company of silent downcast nobles headed by whole assemblage of his aged kinsmen.[2] This he rightly sensed as Rājyavardhana's arrival. Harṣa welcomed him with utmost affection and the latter also expressed a tremendous gesture of elderly love for his younger brother.[3]

HE REQUESTS HARṢA TO ACCEPT THE CROWN

On his return Rājyavardhana made a formal proposal to Harṣa "in the presence of all feudatory cheifs and vassals" that the "situation invited instructions from his elders,"[4] with a request "not to revert to the

---

1. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 164; ह० च०, ष० उच्छ्०, पृ० ३६।
2. *Ibid.*, *P.* 165.
3. *Ibid.*, *P.* 165.
4. *Ibid.*, *P.* 169.

gaucherie so easy to the nature of the young (*nāvalambanīyā bālabhāvasulabhā*).[5] He said, "At sovereignty my eye grows disordered.... my mind seeks to avoid a glory....I cannot endure to abide even a moment in a home which has become a hell."[6]

RĀJYAVARDHANA PLANS TO GO TO A HERMITAGE

With these words he made it clear to Harṣa, "I desire, therefore, in a hermitage to purge with the pure waters of the pellucid streams.... Therefore do you receive from my hands the cares of sovereignty, a gift not high esteemed indeed and reft of the joy of youth, like old age, which Puru welcomed at his father's will. Dismissing all the sports of youth, deliver your bosom like Viṣṇu to the embraces of Lakṣmī. I have abondoned the sword."[7]

HARṢA'S DECISION TO ACCOMPANY RĀJYAVARDHANA

This vow of Rājyavardhana shocked Harṣa and the latter also decided to follow the former to a hermitage.[8] From what Bāṇa says further, it appears quite clear that Rājyavardhana meant every word of what he said. We learn that soon the bark dress (*valkaleṣu*) had been provided (*samupasthāpiteṣu*) by the keeper of the robes (*vastrakarmāntiken*) This created an alarm at the capital. Everybody including the women of the royal household (*rājastraiṇe*), Brāhmaṇas (*viprajane*), groups of citizens (*pauravṛande*), courtiers (*parijane*), kinsmen (*bandhuvarge*), and feudatories (*sāmanteṣu*) were overwhelmingly shocked and completely bewildered.[9]

---

5. *Ibid.*, *P.* 169.
6. *Ibid.*, *P.* 170.
7. *Ibid.*, *P.* 170 'सोऽहमिच्छामि मनसि... शिखरिशिखरप्रस्रवणस्वच्छस्रोतोऽम्बुभिः क्षलयितुमाश्रमपदे। यतस्त्वमन्तरितयौवनसुखामनभिमतामपि जरामिव पूरुराज्ञया गुरोर्गृहाण मे राज्यचिन्ताम्। त्यक्तसकलबालक्रीडेन दीयतामुरो लक्ष्म्यै। परित्यक्तं मया शस्त्रम्। —ह० च०, ष० उच्छ०, पृ० ३९।
8. *HCCTH*, *Pp.* 172-173.
9. *HCCTH.*, *P* 173.

UNEXPECTED ASSASSINATION OF GRAHAVARMAN

At this critical stage when both the brothers were planning to go to hermitage (*tapovana*), Saṁvādaka, personal servant of Rājyaśrī "entered with flowing tears in a bewilderment of grief" (*praviśya śoka-viklavaḥ prakṣaritanayanasalilo*)[10] with a message that Rājyaśrī's husband Grahavarman was "murdered by the wicked lord of Mālvā" (*Durātmanā Mālavarājena*) "on the very day on which the king's death was rumoured" and the princess Rājyaśrī had been "confined like a brigand's wife with a pair of iron fetters kissing her feet (*kālāyasanigaḍayugalachumbitacharaṇā*), and was put into prison (*kārāyām*) at Kānyakubja." He further informed that he had a report that he (*the king of Mālvā*) was planning an attack over the kingdom of Thāneśvara also.[11] This news proved fateful and changed the course of events. This unexpected (*anupekṣaṇiya*), unimagined (*asaṁbhāvitaṁ*) and sudden (*ākasmikaṁ*) disaster (*vyatikraṁ*) brought to an end the feeling of renunciation caused by sorrow. It was replaced by anger. Rājyavardhana declared before all present there, "This day I go to lay the royal house of Mālvā low in ruin. The repression of this beyond measure unmannerly foe—this and no other is my assumption....Mālvās to maltreat the race of Puṣpabhūti !"[12] With this thundering declaration he instructed Harṣa and other feudatories to stay at the capital,[13] and asked Bhaṇḍi[14] to follow him with some ten

10. *HCCTH., P.* 173.

11. *HCCTH., P.* 173.

12. *HCCTH., P.* 175.

13. *Dr. Tripathi opines that it was probably with a view to guarding the rear against any fresh Hūṇa upheaval.*" *THK., P.* 64; *Vaidya also considers it as a matter of convenience and precaution.*" *HMHI., Vol. I., P.* 4.

14. *According to Bāṇa, Bhaṇḍi was son of Yaśovatī's brother. The latter presented Bhaṇḍi when he was about eight years of age (sutamṣṭavarṣadeśiyam ....Kumārayorarapitavān).* *HCCTH., P.* 116; *HCK., Canto* 4, *P.* 10. *We hardly find anything convincing in the view that Yaśovatī's brother was Śilāditya of Mālvā. JRAS.,* 1903, *Pp.* 559-60; *Harṣa, p.* 12, *footnote* 1 *and pp.* 60-62. *It appears that Dr. Mookerji has fully and unhesitatingly followed Dr. Hoernle*

thousand horses and ordered the marching drum (*Prayāṇapaṭaham*) instantly to sound.[15]

Bāṇa tells us that these tidings also inflamed Harṣa with a fit of anger. He appears to be very keen to accompany his elder brother against the 'wicked lord of Mālvā'. With a keen desire he said to Rājyavardhana, "What harm does my lord see in my attending him....if you wish me to guard your rear, valour is your rear-guard; if you argue that the feudatories are uncontrolled they are secured by the bounds of your virtues; if you say a great man must not carry a companion with him, then you count me as distinct from yourself....; if you think it inopportune that two should go, gratify me with the commission....; never before have I been stinted in your favours. Therefore, let my lord be gracious and take me also."[16] So speaking (*ityabhidhāya*) he "sank his head to the ground and fell at his brother's feet."[17] Rājyavardhana upraised him and said, "Why thus dear brother, by putting forth too great an effort add importance to a foe too slight for our power ? A concourse of lions in the

---

(*JRAS.*, 1903 *pp.* 559-60). *The latter appears to have made Rājatarangnī the basis of his observations. Stein has maintained that Kalhaṇa's chronicle is "absolutely unreliable even about the history of the 6th century unless corroborated by reliable and independent evidence." I.*, P. 83, *Shri Vaidya* (*HMHI., Vol. I, pp.* 36-47) *and Dr. Tripathi* (*THK.*, *P.* 64, *footnote.* 4) *have rejected these views. Bāṇa is silent about Bhaṇḍi's father's name. He is introduced to us smiply as 'Yaśovatii's brother.' HCCTH.*, P. 116. *Dr. Tripathi's comments on Dr. Mookerji's view that the name Bhaṇḍi itself is a Huṇic rather than a Saṅskrit name'," are also well made. THK., p.* 64-5. *footnote* 4. *Dr. Mookerji's explanation* (*of Bhaṇḍi's march against his supposed father* (*Śīlāditya of Mālvā*) *and the circumstances underlying his march* (*Harṣa P.* 17, *footnote* 1) *are hardly convincing.*

15. *HCCTH., P.* 175.

16. *Ibid., Pp.* 175-76.

17. *Ibid., P.* 176. तात किमेवमतिमहारम्भपरिग्रहणेन गरिमाणमारोप्यते बलादतिलघीयानप्यहितः। हरिणार्थमतिह्रपणः सिंहसम्भारः। तृणानामुपरि कति हवचयन्त्याशुशुक्षणयः। अपि च तवाष्टादशद्वीपाष्टमङ्गलकमालिनी मेदिन्यस्त्येव विक्रमस्य विषयः। ...तिष्ठतु भवान्।
—हु० च०, ष० उच्छ्०, पृ० ४२

matter of a deer is too degrading.... In the unbearable anger which has been aroused in me for our enemies' death, forgive this one unshared morsel of wrath. Be pleased to stay."[18] This statement of Rājyavardhana reflects his inner confidence he gained after crushing the Hūṇas and it was befitting to his courage to go alone "to lay the royal house of Mālvā low in ruin."

Bāṇa does not tell us anything about Rājyavardhana's acceptance of the Puṣpabhūti crown. It is probably because there was no occasion for any ceremonial installation and formal announcement. But according to Harṣa's records, we get some definite information about it. In these records we find that Rājyavardhana is described as "Paramabhaṭṭāraka Mahārājādhirāja" and by ascribing these full imperial titles to Rājyavardhana these records tell us that Rājyavardhana did come to the throne and his was the active control over the state affairs.

This military expedition of Rājyavardhana was a brilliant success,[19]

---

18. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 176.

19. *Vaidya opines that as a result Devagupta was probably killed in the battle. HMHI., Vol. I, P. 4; Madhuban and Banskhera records and Harṣacharita support this conclusion of the learned scholar. After this expedition of Rājyavardhana, Bāṇa only refers to Gauḍa chief against whom Harṣa made heroic and thunderous utterances. Bāṇa's silence about Mālvā chief, Devagupta at that stage supports latter's death at the hands of Rājyavardhana. His decisive victory is recorded by Bāṇa at a later stage. During his historic march Harṣa met Bhaṇḍi with "Mālvā king's whole force and royal equipage conquered by the might of Rājyavardhana's arm". Harṣa inspected the booty which included "elephants in thousands, horses with gold-bedight chowries, a white umbrella with golden stock, beauteous women....regal paraphernalia such as lion-throne, couches, settees.... and Mālvā king's adherents with their feet restrained by iron-fetters, the whole of this treasure chest heavy laden with wreath of ornaments ....with written records of their contents."* HCCTH., P. 225. *This expedition against Mālā-Gauḍa Axis, however, was a serious engagement. Though Rājyavardhana won the battle but it appears that he won it after great efforts. Bhaṇḍi, who accompanied Rājyavardhana returned and met Harṣa with "his breast filled with the points of enemies' arrows" and "with his limbs enfeebled."* Ibid., Pp. 223-224.

but it ended in disaster. Harṣa's records inform us that Rājyavardhana, "playing his whip in battle," succeeded in quelling his enemies. These enemies, according to these records, were "the king Devagupta and others who resembled wicked horses." "They were all subdued with averted faces." But Rājyavardhana, after uprooting his enemies, after conquering the earth, and (*after*) doing what was agreeable to his subjects, in consequence of his adherence to his promise gave up his life in the mansion of his foe."[20]

This information is further corroborated and supplemented by Bāṇa. He tells us that the message of Rājyavardhana's plight was conveyed by Kuntala, chief officer of the cavalry to Harṣa, when, the latter was in the audience chamber. He was informaed that his brother, though he had routed the Mālvā army with ridiculous ease, had been allured to confidence by false civilities on the part of Gauḍa king[21] and then weaponless, confiding and alone, despatched in his own quarters."[22]

---

20. *Ep. Ind., Vol. I, P.* 70 *and* 74. युधि दुष्टवाजिन इव श्रीदेवगुप्तादय: कृत्वायेन कशाप्रहारविमुखास्सर्व्वें समं संयता:। उत्खास द्विषतो विजित्य वसुधा त्वा प्रजानां प्रियं प्राणानुज्झितवानरातिभवने सत्यानुरोधेन य:।

21. *According to Yuan Chwang, king of Karṇasuvarṇa. Watters, I, p.* 343; *Beal, I, P.* 210. *One manuscript of Harṣacharita refers to him as Narendragupta. Cited by Bühler, Ep. Ind., Vol. I, p.* 70.

22. *HCCTH., p.* 178. तस्माच्च हेलानिर्जितमालवानीकमपि गौडाधिपेन मिथ्योपचारोपचितविश्वासं मुक्तशस्त्रमेकाकिनं विश्रब्धं स्वभवन एव भ्रातरं व्यापादितमश्रौषीत्। ह० च०, ष० उच्छ०, पृ० ४३। *Both Madhuban and Banskhera and Harṣacharita are silent about "adherence to promise" and 'allurement'. The commentator on Harṣacharita, however, makes a suggestion that Śaśāṅka allured him for offering his daughter's hand. cited in HMHI., Vol. I, P.* 4. *Dr. Mookerji cites a "novel suggestion" made by A. K. Maitra in his Gauḍarājamālā that Rājyavardhana "died in an open conflict with Śaśāṅka. Harṣa, P.* 19, *note* 1. *Like him several other historians try to deny the charge of treacherous murder against Śaśāṅka. R. C. Majumdar, Early History of Bengal, Vol. I, P.* 17; *R. D. Banarjee, Early History of Orissa, Vol. I, P.* 126; *Gauḍarājamālā, Pp.* 8-10; *Basaka, HNEI., P.* 146; *Prabasi,*

This tragedy was another great shock to Harṣa in succession of shocks caused by his father's death, preceded by his mother's self-immolation (*satī*), murder of Grahavarman, and imprisonment imposed upon his younger sister Rājyaśrī. It "made his fiery spirit blaze forth in a storm of sorrow augmented by flaming of furious wrath" (*prachaṇḍakopapāvakaprasaraparichīyamānaśokāvegaḥ sahasaiva prajajvāla*) He was "quivering without cessation" (*anavaratasphuriten*), "with reddening eyes" (*lohitāyamānalochana*), "with fire of anger" (*roṣānalena*) and "his very limbs trembled as if in affright at such unexpected fury" (*svāvayavairapyadṛṣṭapūrvaprakopabhītairiva kampamānairupetaḥ*).[23] In that state of unprecedented anger combined with sorrow he "represented the first revelation of valour (*pūrvāgaṁ iva pauruṣasya*), "the frenzy of insolence" (*unmāda iva madasya*) "the delirium of pride" (*āvega iva ivāvalepasya*), "the youthful incarnation of fury" (*tāruṇyāvatāra iva tejasaḥ*), "the supreme efforts of hauteur" (*sarvodyoga iva darpasya*) "the new age of manhood's fire" (*yugāma iva yauvanoṣmaṇaḥ*), "the regal consecration of war-like passion (*rājyābhiṣeka iva raṇasya*) and "the camp-lustration day of resentment" (*nīrājanadivasa ivāsahiṣṇutāyāḥ*)

In such a state of mind Harṣa thundered, "Except the Gauḍa king, what man would by such a murder, abhorred of all the world, lay such a great soul low....in the very moment when, having by his arm's undissembling valour subdued all princes, he had laid the sword aside ?.... How could he put forth his hands, regardless of friendly advances, to take my lord's life ? What shall be his doom ?....My tongue seems soiled with a smirch of sin as I take the miscreant's very name upon my lips. With what design did this mean remorseless being bring my lord to his death....? By lighting up this evil path this vilest of the Gauḍas has

---

Asvin, 1339. *But what they write is an attempt to put a heavy smoke-screen on the black deed of the first emperor of Bengal.' We cannot agree with the scholars on this point as all our original sources unhesitatingly prove that Śaśāṅka committed a cold-blooded and treacherous murder of Rājyavardhana.*

23. *HCCTH.*, P. 178; ह० च०, च० उच्छ०, पृ० ४२।

24. *Ibid.*, *Pp.* 178-179.

collected only foul shame to the soiling of his own house.... Who is not bound to punish such vile jewellers whlo deface the most brilliant gems ? What now will be the wretch's fate." ?[25]

Now, before we proceed further, it is better to analyse the whole situation. We have seen that Saṁvādaka, Rājyaśrī's servant, had brought the news of Grahavarman's murder by "the wicked lord of Mālvā" and it was to avenge that brutal murder of his brother-in-law, Rājyavavdhana left Thāneśvara and "to lay the royal house of Mālvā low in ruin." Thus it is clear that till this stage we hear only of Mālvā king, who treacherously murdered Grahavarman.

This Mālvā king was probably Devagupta as reffered to in the Madhubana and Banskhera records.[26] But these epigraphic evidences do not refer to Rājyavardhana's foe in whose "mansion" he "gave up his life" "in consequence of his adherence to his promise."

This "foe", according to Harṣacharita, is the lord of Gauḍas. This makes it clear that the lord of Mālvā was an ally of the Gauḍa king. Rājyavardhana successfully avenged the assassination of his brother-in-

---

25. *Ibid., P.* 179-180." गौडाधिपाधममपहाय कस्तादृशं महापुरुषं तत्क्षणं एव निर्व्याजमुजवीर्यनिर्जितसमस्तराजकं मुक्तशस्त्रं कलशयोनिमिव कृष्णवर्त्मप्रसूतिरीदृशेन सर्ववीर-लोकविगर्हितेन मृत्युना शमयेदार्यं म्। अनार्यं च यं मुक्त्वा भागीरथीफेनपटलपाण्डुराः केषां मनःसुसरःसु राजहंसा इव परशुरामपराक्रमस्मृतिकृतो न कुर्युरार्यशौर्यगुणाः पक्षपातम्। कथमिवास्य प्रस्यास्यार्यजीवितहरणे निदाघरवेरिव कमलाकरसलिलशोषणेऽनपेक्षितप्रीतयः प्रसृताः कराः। कां नु गतिं गमिष्यति, कां वा योनिं प्रवेक्ष्यति, कस्मिन्वा नरके निपतिष्यति। श्वपाकोऽपि क इदमाचरेत्। नामापि गृह्णतो स्य पापकारिणः पापकमलेन लिप्यत इव मे जिह्वा। किं वाङ्गीकृत्य कार्यं मार्यं स्तेन क्षुद्रेणानुप्रविश्य विगतघृणेन घुणेनेव सकलभुवनाह्लादनचतुरश्चन्दनस्तम्भः क्षयमुपनीतः। नूनं नानेन मूढेन मधुरसास्वादलुब्धेन मक्षिकयार्यजीवितमाकर्षता भावी दृष्टः कष्टशिलीमुखसम्पातोपद्रवः। निजगृहदूषणं जालमार्गप्रदीपकेन कज्जलमिवातिमलिनं केवलमयशः संचितं गौडाधमेन। न त्वाश्रयवास्तमुपगतवत्यपि त्रिभुवनचूडामणौ सवितरि वेधसादिष्टः सत्पथशत्रोरन्धकारस्य निग्रहाय ग्रहषण्डविहारैकहरिणाधिपः शशी। विनयविधायिनि मत्तेऽपि चांकुशे विद्युत एव व्यालवारणस्य विनयाय सकलमतमातङ्गकुम्भस्थलस्थिरशिरोभागभिदुरः खरतरः केसरिनखरः। तादृशाः कुवैकटिका इव तेजस्विरत्नविनाशकाः कस्य न वध्याः। क्वेदानीं यास्यति दुर्बुद्धिः। —ह० च०, ष० उच्छ्०, पृ० ४४।

26. *Ep. Ind., Vol. I, Pp.* 70 *and* 74, *Ibid., Vol. IV, Pp.* 208-11.

law Grahavarman by killing Devagupta and others, and it was after this brilliant success the Gauḍa king treacherously killed Rājyavardhana.

His decisive victory is recorded by Bāṇa at a later stage. During his historic march Harṣa met Bhaṇḍi "with Mālvā king's whole force and royal equipage conquered by the might of Rājyavardhana's arm." Harṣa inspected the booty which included "elephants in thousands, horses with lines of gold-bedight chowries, ornaments....wondrous pearl necklaces, chowries, a white umbrella with golden stock, beauteous women... regal paraphernalia such as lion throne, couches, and settees...and Mālvā king's adherents with their feet restrained by iron fetters, the whole of his treasure-chests, heavy laden with wreath of ornaments...with written records of their contents.[27]

Now we have two major issues to decide. Firstly, who was this Devagupta of Mālvā and secondly, who is meant by the lord of Gauḍa ? At the same time we have also to decide the location and geographical limits of Mālvā. We have seen that Mahāsenagupta shifted from Magadha to Mālvā and after his defeat his two sons Kumāragupta and Mādhavagupta got shelter at Prabhākaravardhana's court. All sources of this period are silent about Devagupta's family. Banskhera and Madhubana inscriptions refer to him and other kings as "wicked horses." Bāṇa also does not mention his name. Devagupta himself has also left no record of his own. We also do not know of any other branch or any independent family of the Guptas in India at that time. But we can, take it for granted that king Devagupta of Madhubana and Banskhera records can safely be identified with Bāṇa's king of Mālvā.[28] He appears to have been connected with the family of the Later Guptas. Some scholars have also suggested that Devagupta was the eldest son of Mahāsenagupta and that an omission

---

27. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 225.

28. *PHAI.*, *6th Ed.*, *P.* 607. *Dr. Raychaudhary has ruled out the suggestion that "the Mālvā antagonist of Grahavarman and Rājyavardhana was Buddharājā of the Kalachuri (Kaṭachchuri) family." Ibid.*, *P.* 607. *fn.* 3.

of his name in the Aphaṣaḍ inscription[29] can be explained with that of Skandagupta from Bhitari records.[30]

This view cannot be accepted before we get some definite proof to support it.[31] The events prove that Devagupta conspired with Kalachuri ruler Śaṅkaragaṇa against Mahāsenagupta. Abhonā plates of Śaṅkaragaṇa give us this impression.[32] We hear nothing of Mahāsenagupta except his sons Kumāragupta and Mādhavagupta reaching Sthāneśvara. It appears that Devagupta must have been one of the kings who are said to have been "renistalled" by Śaṅkaragaṇa and Mahāsenagupta might have been one of the "up-rooted" kings.

It was, probably, for this act of treason he finds no mention in Bāṇa's Harṣacharita and in the family records of the Later Guptas.[33] It also appears almost certain that after such a miserable plight of Mahāsenagupta who was maternal uncle to Prabhākaravardhana the latter must have attacked Mālvā in order to anvenge the defeat or death of his maternal uncle.

---

29. *CII., Vol. III, No. 42, Pp. 200f.*

30. *Dr. Hoernle was first to suggest it. JRAS., 1903, p. 562. It has been treated by Vaidya as the "ingenious guess." HMHI., Vol. I, P. 35; Dandekar, History of the Guptas, p. 108; Saletore, Life in the Gupta Age, p. 11.*

31. *This suggestion has been rightly rejected by Dr. Raychaudhary. He says, "Devagupta may have represented a collateral line of the Mālvā family who continued to pursue a policy hostile to Pushyabhūtis and Maukharis, while Kumāra and Mādhava, the Gupta kulputras who connived at the escape of Rājyaśrī from Kusasthala (Kanauj), and Ādityasena, son of Mādhava, who gave his daughter in marriage to a Maukhari, may have belonged to a friendly branch." PHAI., 6th Ed., P. 608, fn. 1.*

32. *Abhona plates record that he "reinstalled families of kings" and "uprooted those that were too proud." Ep. Ind., Vol. IX, Pp. 299f.*

33. *Vaidya appears to be correct when he says that Hoernle's guess that Devagupta was brother to Mādhavagupta and Kumāragupta "seems to be acceptable that they were on inimical terms and it may be supplemented by the suggestion that Kumāra and Mādhava were not merely the younger brothers of Devagupta, but were*

A reference has been made above to Hoernle's theory that the king of Mālvā was king Śīlāditya, son and successor of Yaśodharmana Vikramāditya. According to the learned scholar, Prabhākaravardhana, Grahavarman and Rājyavardhan fought against this king Śīlāditya. Devagupta of eastern Mālvā and Śaśāṅka were his allies.[34]

This view of Hoernle has hardly anything to commend. Śīlāditya of (Mo-la-po)[35] has been identified by Levi with Śīlāditya, son and successor of Dharasena II of Valabhī,[36] and this identification has been accepted as correct by Smith[37] and others.[38] If we accept Mālvā (mo-la-po) as a province under Śīlāditya I Dharmāditya our difficulty is almost solved, and this acceptance is further corroborated by Valabhī records.[39]

Bühler, however, tells us that "Mālvā need not refer here[40] or in the other passage of Śrīhārṣacharita to the Mālvā in Central India." He

---

his half brothers, or sons by another wife of Mahāsenagupta." HMHI., Vol. I, P. 35-6. *He says further that "this suggestion" also removes "the difficulty of explaining why the sons of a king were given as companions of another king. Kumāra and Mādhava had no right to the throne being younger sons and their presence in Mālvā was not very palatable to the eldest son and heir-apparent Devagupta." Ibid., Pp.* 35-36.

34. *JRAS.*, 1903, *P.* 543*f*; *Ibid.*, 1909, *P.* 125*f.*

35. *Watters, II, P.* 242; *Beal, II, Pp.* 260-70. *AGI., Pp.* 489-94. *According to Yuan Chwang, he flourished sixty years before his visit. This makes him to have ruled about the last quarter of the* 6*th century A.D., and Devagupta, according to Harṣa's own record, was contemporary of Rājyavardhana and Harṣa, and, therefore, we can easily reject Hoernle's opinion on chronological grounds.*

36. *Journal Des Savants*, 1905, *Pp.* 544-548, *cited by Smith EHI., P.* 344, *footnote* 2.

37. *Ibid., Pp.* 343-45.

38. *Dr. K. Virji, Ancient History of Saurastra, Pp.* 47*f.*

39. *This can be proved on the basis of Virdi plates* (616 *A.D.*) *of his successor Kharagraha I. Proceed. AIOC., (VII session), Pp.* 659*f.*

40. *i.e. in the Madhubana grant of Harṣa. Ep. Ind., Vol. I, Pp.* 67-75.

adds, "There was another Mālvā in Punjab, much near to Thāneśvara, which may be meant."[41]

Bühler's opinion deserves serious consideration, but with an account furnished above in view Mālvā of Madhubana and Banskhera records and that of Harṣacharita must be Mālvā of Central India. We must remember that Devagupta of Mālvā was instrumental in forming an alliance with Śaśāṅka of Gauḍa. If we accept Bühler's suggestion for a time-being we have to explain how an alliance could be formed between Mālvā of Punjab and Gauḍa, a place really very far from Punjab and, therefore, it does not seem very probable that an alliance could have been concluded between Mālvā king of Punjab, as suggested by Bühler and Śaśāṅka of Gauḍa against Grahvarman of Kanauj. Alliance could have been possible between Mālvā of Central India and Gauḍa against Kanauj, a place not very far off.

In fact Mālvā problem has baffled historians, and we have Mālvā not only in Punjab or Central India but elsewhere also.[42]

Secondly, we have to note that an area of military operations between Rājyavardhana and Devagupta was not Mālvā. It must have been Kanauj or its vicinity. Prabhākaravardhana's attack against Mālvā, as referred to by Bāṇa, must have taken place against Mālvā in Central Indian territory. But Rājyavardhana did not reach Mālvā in Central India.

We must also note that the rising power of Puṣpabhūtis could not have allowed an existence of any such power in Punjab.[43] And if any

41. *Ibid., P.* 70.

42. *AGI., Pp.* 489-494; *Watters, Vol. II, Pp.* 242-248; *Beal, Vol. II, Pp.* 260-270; *Rājataraṅgiṇī, Vol. I, P.* 66; *JRAS.*, 1903, *P.* 553; *Ibid.*, 1905, *P.* 837, *Ibid.*, 1906. *P.* 95 *and P.* 220; *Ind. Ant.*, 1905, *P.* 195; *Journal des Savants*, 1905, *Pp.* 544-548; *EHI., 4th Ed., P.* 344, *fn.* 2.

43. *Bāṇa says that Kuntala, who brought the news of Rājyavardhana's death, "had a face, hairy with the long growth of mourning (duḥhadūraprarūḍharomṇā). HCCTH., P. 178; HCK., Canto 6, P. 43. This shows that Kuntala took many days to reach Thāneśvara from the scene of battle between Mālvā-Gauḍa axis and Rājyavardhana and his scene of battle, therefore, can not be in Punjab or its immediate neighbourhood.*

power existed in Punjab at all and if Bühler's opinion is accepted for a time being, was it possible for that power to take such an offensive step of murdering Grahavarmana, a strong Maukhari ruler of Kanauj ? We have seen that the Kanauj kingdom was at its zenith at that time and the occupant of the Kanauj throne was related to such a great family of the Puṣpabhūtis of Thāneśvara. Both these powers of Kanauj and Thāneśvara were at the height of their political glory. The supposition that any small power of Punjab would have taken a step of attacking Kanauj at that time, therefore, is untenable. Devagupta "a wicked" horse was the ruler of Mālvā. And this Mālvā was Mālvā of Central India.[44]

Now the question before us is that who was the ally of Devagupta ? Madhubana and Banskhera records speak nothing about him. They refer to "Devagupta and others" who "were all subdued with averted faces."

Harṣacharita supplements this information and informs us that those "others" (of Madhubana and Banskhera records) included the Gauḍa king (*Gauḍādhipa*). We are told by Bāṇa that Rājyavardhana's murderer was the Gauḍa king.[45] When Harṣa thundered in anger his father's old friend and Senāpatī Siṁhanāda, after a very lengthy advice said, "Think not of the Gauḍa king alone; so deal that for the future no other follow his example. Wave the chowries of the mock conquerors... by the sight of the matrons in their harems. Excise their vicious cravings for the umbrella's shade....Dispel with excudations of tepid blood the

---

44. *Ep. Ind., Vol. I, P.* 74.

45. *HCCTH., P.* 178. *Bühler has brought to our notice that the king of Gauḍa, according to one MSS. of Harṣacharita was Narendragupta. Ep. Ind. Vol. I, P.* 70. *It is also argued that the king of Gauḍa who killed Rājyavardhana was named Narendragupta and not Śaśāṅka. The latter was Narendragupta's Mahāsāmanta. Quoted by K. L. Barua, JRAS., I, P.* 97; *DKM., P.* 225, *fn.* 3. *But the Chinese pilgrim's clear reference to Śaśāṅka, the king of Karṇasuvarṇa, the murderer of Rājyavardhana and Bāṇa's indirect reference to him make it certain that the man who killed Rājyavardhana was Śaśāṅka, the king of Karṇasuvarṇa. Watters, Vol. I, P.* 34.

unhealthy flush of eyes diseased by the side glances of the harlot,....By the letters of stern command in caustic showers ally the itching of ears alert for the cry of "Victory". Remove the unhealthy rigidity of stiff unbending heads....With levies of tribute for nippers extract the splinters of unmannerly forwardness inflamed by the arrogance of wealth..... Pierce the darkness of soldiers....Overcome the complications of vain pride....soften the hardness of the bow-strings callosities by the warmth of clasped hands folded in a perpetual obeisance."[46] But he cautioned this advice with following words, "Forsake not the path along which your sire, grandsire, and great grandsire have marched.... Appropriate the royal glory which is your heritage. Now that the king has assumed his godhead and Rājyavardhana had lost his life by the sting of the vile Gauḍa serpent, you are the only Śeśa left[47] to support the earth. Comfort your unprotected people....Set your forehead-burning footsteps upon the heads of kings....You this very day register a resolve, and for the wreck of this meanest of Gauaḍas' life take up the bow....."[48]

---

46. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 185. "यतः किं गौडाधिपाधमेनैकेन। तथा कुरु यथा नान्योऽपि कश्चिदाचरत्येवं भूयः। सर्वोर्वीश्रद्धोकामुकानामलीकविजिगीषूणा सञ्चारय चामराण्यन्तः पुरपुरंध्रिनिश्वसितैः। उच्छिन्धि रुधिरगन्धान्धगृध्रमण्डलाच्छादनैश्छत्रच्छायाव्यसनानि। अपाकुरु कदुष्णशोणितोदकस्वेदैः कुलक्ष्मीकुलटाकटाक्षचक्षूरागरोगान्। उपशमय निशितशरशिरावेधरकायंशौर्यश्वययूथन्। उन्मूलय लोहनिगडापीडमालामलमहौषधैः पादपीठदोहदुर्ललितपादपट्टमान्धानि। क्षपय तीक्ष्णाज्ञाक्षरक्षारपाजंयशब्दश्रवणकर्णकण्डूः। अपनय चरणनखमरीचिचन्दनचर्चाललाटलेपरनमितस्तिमितमस्तकस्तम्भविकारान्। उद्धर करदानसन्देशसन्दशद्रविणदपोष्मायमाणदुःशीललीलाशल्यानि। भिन्धि मणिपादपीठदीधितिप्रदीपिकाभिः शुष्कसुभटाटोपभृकुटिबन्धान्धकारान्। जय चरणलंघनलाघवगलितशिरोगौरवारोग्यैर्मिथ्याभिमानमहासन्निपातान्। मुदय सततसेवाञ्जलिमुकुलितकरसम्पुटोष्मभिरिष्वसनगुणकिणकार्कश्यानि।

—हृ० च०, ष० उच्छ्०, पृ० ४६-४७.

47. *Śeśa also stands here for Śeṣa, the serpent who supports the earth. Ibid.*, *P.* 185, *fn.* 3.

48. *Ibid.*, *Pp.* 185-186. "येनैव ते गतः पिता पितामहः प्रपितामहो वा तमेव मा हासीस्त्रिभुवनस्पृहणीयं पन्थानम्। अपहाय कुपुरुषोचितां शुचं प्रतिपद्यस्व कुलक्रमागतां केसरीव कुरंगीं राजलक्ष्मीम्। देव, देवभूयं गते नरेन्द्रे दुष्टगौडभुजङ्गजग्धजीविते च राज्यवर्धने वृत्तेऽस्मिन्महाप्रलये धरणीधारणायाधुना त्वं शेषः। समाश्वासय अशरणाः प्रजाः क्ष्मापतीनां शिरःसु शरत्सवितेव

With these words reminding Harṣa of past heroes the old commander ended his great oration.

In response to this advice Harṣa replied, "The advice of your eminence deserves to be acted upon....My hand yearns to clutch the tresses of the very hills that will not bow....Enraged at the title of king, my foot itches to make foot stools of even the kings of beasts. My lip quivers to command.....My mind, brimming with passion, has no rooms for complying with the observances of mourning. Nay, so long as this vile outcast of Gauḍa king, this world-condemned miscreant....survives, like a cruel thorn in my heart, I am ashamed....until I evoke a storm of rain from the tremulous eyes of the wives of hostile hosts, how can my hands present the oblation of water ? But small store of tears have these eyes till they have seen the smoke cloud from this vilest of Gauḍas' pyre."[49] With these words he took a vow, "By the dust of my honoured lord's Leet I swear that, unless in a limited number of days I clear this earth of Gauḍas, and make it resound with fetters on the feet of all kings who are excited to

---

ललाटंतपान्प्रयच्छ पादन्यासान्। अहितानामभिनवसेवादीक्षादुःखसन्तप्तश्वासधूममण्डलैर्नखम्पर्बैः प्रचलितचूडामणिचक्रवालबालातपैश्नायाहि कल्माषपादताम्। अपि च हृते पितर्येकाकी तपस्वी मृगः सह सर्वाधितः सहजब्राह्मण्यमार्दवसुकुमारमनाः कृतोनिश्चयश्चण्डचापवनाटनिटाकारनाद-निर्मदीकृतदिग्गजं गुजज्ज्याजालजनितजगज्ज्वर समग्रमुद्यतमेकविंशतिकृत्वः कृतवंशमुत्खात-वान्राजन्यकं परशुरामः किं पुनर्नैसर्गिककायकार्कश्यकुलिशायमानमानसो मानिनां मूर्धन्यो देवः। तदद्यैव कृतप्रतिज्ञो गृहाण गौडाधमजीवितध्वस्तये जीवितसंकलनाकुलकालाकाण्डयात्राचिन्हध्वजं धनुः। —हृ० च०, ष० उच्छ०, पृ० ४७।

49. *Ibid.*, *Pp.* 186-87. "करणीयमेवेदमभिहितं मान्येन। इतरथा हि मे गृहीतभुवि भोगिनाथेऽपि दायादवृष्टिरीर्ष्यालोभुर्जजस्य। उपरि गच्छतीच्छति निग्रहाय ग्रहगणेऽपि भ्रूलता चलितुम्। अनमत्सु शैलेष्वपि कचग्रहमभिलषति दातु करः। तेजोदुर्विदग्धानर्ककरानपि चामराणि ग्राहयितुमीहते हृदयम्। राजशब्दरुषा मृगराजानामपि शिरांसि वांछति पादः पादपीठीकर्तुम्। स्वच्छन्दलोकपालस्वेच्छागृहीतानामाक्षेपादेशाय दिशामपि स्फुरत्यधरः। किं पुनरीदृशे कुजाति जाते जातामर्षनिर्भरं च मनसि नास्त्येवावकाशः शोकक्रियाकरणस्य। अपि च हृदयविषमशल्ये मुसल्ये जीवति जाल्मे जगद्विगर्हिते गौडाधिपाधम-चण्डाले जिह्वेमि शुष्काधरपुटः पोटेव प्रतिकार-शून्यं शुचा सूत्कर्तुम्। मद्दृतरिपुबलाबलाविलोललोचनोदकदुर्दिनस्य मे कुतः करयुगलस्य जलाञ्ज-लिदानम्। अदृष्टगौडाधमचिताधूममण्डलस्य वा चक्षुषः स्वल्पमप्यश्रुसलिलम्।

—हृ० च०, ष० उच्छ०, पृ० ४७।

insolence by the elasticity of their bows, then will I hurl my sinful self, like a moth, into an oil-fed flame."[50]

After this historic declaration, "he gave instructions to Avanti, the supreme minister of war and peace, 'Let a proclamation be engraved' : "As far as the orient hill....as far as Suleva[51]...., as far as Gandhamādana,....let all kings prepare their hands to give tribute or grasp swords to seize the realms of space or chowries, let them bend their heads or their bows, grace their ears with either my commands or their bowstrings, crown their heads with the dust of my feet or with helmets, join suppliant hands or troops of elephants, let go their lands or arrows, grasp mace-staves or lance-staves, take a good view of themselves in the nails of my feet or the mirrors of their swords.... Like a cripple, how can I rest, so long as my feet are not besmeared with an ointment found in every continent, consisting of the light of precious stones in the diadems of all kings ?"[52]

We are told by Bāṇa that because of extreme sorrow and mournful thoughts Harṣa could not take a proper sleep and "when the day dawned he gave instructions to the chamberlain" to inform Skandagupta, the

---

50. *Ibid.*, *P.* 187. "श्रुयता मे प्रतिज्ञा। शपाम्यार्यस्यैव पादपांशुस्पर्शेन यदि परिगणितरेव वासरः सकलचापचापलदुर्ललितनरपतिचरणरणरणायमाननिगडां निर्गौडां न करोमि मेदिनी ततस्तनूनपाति पीतसर्पिषि पतंग इव पातकी पातयाम्यात्मानम्"।

—ह० च०, ष० उच्छ०, पृ० ४७।

51. *A mountain in Ceylon. Ibid.*, *P.* 197, *fn.* 4.

52. *Ibid.*, *P.* 188; उदयाचलात्, आ त्रिकूटकटककुट्टाकट लिखितकाकुत्स्थालुण्ठनव्यतिकरात्सुवेलात्, आ वारुणीमदस्खलितवरुणवरनारीनूपुररवमुखरकुहरकुबेरस्तगिरेः, आ गुह्यकगेहिनीपरिमेलसुगन्धिगन्धपाषाणवासितगुहागृहाच्च गन्धमादनात्, सर्वेषां आज्ञां सज्जीक्रियन्तां कराः करदानाय शस्त्रग्रहणाय वा, गृह्यन्तां दिशश्चामराणि वा, नमन्तु शिरांसि धनूंषि वा, कर्णपूरीक्रियन्तामाज्ञा मौर्व्यो वा, शेखरीभवन्तु पादरजांसि शिरस्त्राणि वा, घटन्तां संजलयः करिघटाबन्धा वा, मुच्यन्तां भूमय इषवो वा, समालम्ब्यन्तां वेत्रयष्टयः कुन्तयष्टयो वा, सुदृष्टः क्रियतामात्मा मच्चरणनखेषु कृपाणदर्पणेषु वा परागतोऽहमिति। पंगोरिव मे कुतो निवृत्तिस्तावद्यावन्न कृतः सर्वद्वीपान्तरसञ्चारी सकलनरपतिमुकुटमणिशिलालोकमयः पादलेपः।"

—ह० च, ष० उच्छ०, पृ० ४८।

commandant of the whole elephant troops (*gajasādhanādhikṛtaṁ*).[53] When Skandagupta reached before Harṣa the latter instructed the former that he "must hastily call in the elephant herds out at pasture" and told him that the "hot pain of my brother's defeat forbids even the briefest delay in marching."[54]

Skandagupta heard the command and he also spoke a few words of advice to Harṣa,[55] and then left the palace in order to execute the orders. A day of marching was fixed with careful astronomical calculation. With an approval by astronomers the marching drums (*nāndis*) were beaten at the starting place fixed at a large temple near the capital.[56]

ALLIANCE WITH BHĀSKARAVARMANA

Bāṇa refers to an alliance between Harṣa and the king Bhāskara-varmana (styled as Kumāra) of Assam (*Prāgjyotiṣa*). We are told that while Harṣa was resting at one of his camps during his march, he met Haṁsavega, a confidential messanger (*dūto-antaraṅgaḥ*) sent by the lord of Prāgjyotiṣa, who had reached there with many presents from his master to Harṣa. These presents included an umbrella, "a present worthy of Harṣa's status" (*anurūpaṁ*). This umbrella was named Abhoga.[58]

---

53. *Ibid., P.* 189.

54. *Ibid., P.* 191.

55. *This elderly peace of advice contains reference to several disastrous episodes caused due to mistakes and carelessness.*

56. *Ibid., P.* 196.

57. *The learned editors transalate 'Kumāreṇa' as by the heir-apparent. HCCTH., P.* 211. *This is wrong. We know that Bhāskaravarmana of Kāmarūpa was also known as Kumāra. Bāṇa himself calls him the lord of the Prāgjyotiṣa (Prāgajyotiṣeśvara). This shows that he was not the crown prince but the fully consecrated sovereign ruler. How can an heir-apparent make an offer of alliance. His very messenger and the powers delegated to him by the ruler of Assam, reveal that Kumāra was the sovereign ruler of Prāgjyotiṣa.*

58. *Bāṇa gives a mythical origin of this wonderful umbrella. It was derived from Varuṇa..... The king, who, like Varuṇa, is or is to be the sovereign*

It was sent specially "to add substance to his (*Bhāskaravarmana's*) message." In addition to this umbrella, there were many presents consisting of fine and rare ornaments and various other presentable articles.

Speaking about his master Haṁsavega told that "from childhood upward" it was his master's "firm resolution never to do homage to any king except the lotus feet of Śiva."[59] Emphasizing the importance of the bonds of friendship Haṁsavega told, "The sovereign of Prāgjyotiṣa desires with Your Majesty an imperishable alliance....If Your Majesty's heart too is inclined to friendship....Commission me to say that the sovereign of Prāgjyotiṣa may enjoy Your Majesty's hearty embrace....." The messanger also added, "If your Majesty accepts not his love, command me what to report to my master.[60]" Harṣa readily welcomed this offer of friendship and conveyed his willingness with reciprocal gesture of goodwill. He said to Haṁsavega, "How could the mind of one like me possibly even in a dream show aversion, when such a great and noble spirit....bestows his love....The prince's design too is excellent. Stout-armed himself, with me, a devotee of the bow, for his friend, to whom save śiva need he pay homage ? This resolve of his increases my affection...."

It also appears that Harṣa not only welcomed the offer of friendship, but he had the sincere desire to cement these bonds further. Harṣa said to Haṁsavega that the latter must "use his endeavours" so that his "yearning to see the prince may not torment" him for long. And as a gesture of friendship he "sent Haṁsavega away with a load of answering gifts in charge of eminent envoys."

Afterwards he resumed his journey and "advanced by ceaseless marches against the foe." During the march he was informed by a letter-carrier that Bhaṇḍi "had arrived with the Mālvā king's whole force, conquered by the might of Rājyavardhana's arm." He was encamped in the

---

of four oceans, was to enjoy its shade. It had many super-natural qualities. HCCTH., *Pp.* 212*f.*

59. *Compare such reference to Yaśodharamana. CII., Vol. III., No.* 33, *Pp.* 146-48.

60. *HCCTH., P.* 218.

vicinity of Harṣa's camp. Bhaṇḍi followed the message and related to Harṣa the whole course of events. He showed Harṣa the Mālvā king's "army and royal equipage, won by the power of Rājyavardhana's arm." When Harṣa inquired of him about Rājyaśrī he told that he "learnt from common talk that after His Majesty Rājyavardhana was taken to paradise and Kānyakubja was seized by the man named Gupta, queen Rājyaśrī burst from her confinement, and with her train, entered the Vindhya forest. But not to this day have the numerous searches sent after her returned." He quickly told, "What care I for other seekers ?...I myself, abandoning all other calls, will go", and hastened to add, "You (*Bhaṇḍi*) must take the army and advance against the Gauḍa." He set out in search of Rājyaśrī in the Vindhya forests.

During his wandering in the Vindhya region he met Vyāghraketu, son of Śarabhaketu, a tributary chief in the forest, and Nirghāta, son of Bhūkampa, the lord of all Vindhya range. They took Harṣa to a Buddhist muni Divākaramitra, a follower of Maitrāyanī śākhā, the boy friend of Grahavarman.[61] He was "a leading Brāhmaṇa teacher" and "had turned his studies to Buddhist doctrine and assumed the red dress."[62] It was at his hermitage Harṣa learnt from a mendicant that "a young woman overpowered by heavy misfortune" was preparing to burn herself by "mounting the funeral pile."[64]

Harṣa, "fearful of his sister", made further inquiries which made it sure that the lady was indeed his sister. He rushed to the site of funeral pile followed by Divākaramitra and his disciples and "his tributary kings." He soon reached there and heard his lamenting sister who was found "fainting as she prepared to enter the funeral pyre." Harṣa pressed her forehead and Rājyaśrī, "at that reviving touch" of her brother, "opened her eyes." She was pacified by Harṣa and the ladies attending her.

The king then introduced her to Divākaramitra. Rājyaśrī conveyed to Harṣa through her betel-bearer, Patralatā, her desire to "be

61. *Ibid., Pp.* 230-232.
62. *Ibid., Pp.* 232-233.
63. *Ibid., P.* 240.

allowed to assume the red-robe." Harṣa heard her request silently, but Divākaramitra consoled her at length and said that "sorrow had made a wide inroad" in her life and she should have regards for her elder brother who was "as a guru and as a father...." He asked Rājyaśrī, "Were it not for him (Harṣa) who would not honour thy resolve to assume the red dress ?" And he added, "A holy mendicant life is the surest consolation for every sorrow; this is the best home for the wise. But he now stops thy desire, for thou must only do what he commands;....thou must in any case obey his decree."[64]

Harṣa does not appear to have liked this idea as we learn from his reply to the Muni. Expressing his deep sense of gratitude and reverence Harṣa said that Rājyaśrī, "so young and so tired by adversity, must be cherished by me for a while, even if it involves the neglect of all my royal duties...." He also reiterated his vow "to destroy the insolent enemies who had slain my brother; and unable to endure the insult offered, I surrendered my whole soul to righteous vengeance."[65]

He then requested Divākaramitra to be his guest and expressed his "desire that she should remain at my side and be comforted with your righteous discourses and your passionless instruction which produces salutary knowledge...." And he hastened to add, "When I have accomplished my design, she and I will assume red (*Kāṣyaṇi*) garments together."[66] Harṣa stayed at the hermitage for that night and the next morning he left the forest abode along with his sister and the holy man to "his camp stationed along the bank of the Gaṅgā."[67]

---

64. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 257. अखिलमनोज्वरप्रशमनकारणं हि भगवती प्रव्रज्या । ज्यायः खल्विदं पदमात्मवताम् । महाभागस्तु भिनत्ति मनोरथमधुना । यदयमाशिषति तदेवानुष्ठेयम् । यदि भ्रातेति यदि ज्येष्ट इति यदि वत्सल इति यदिगुणवानितियदि राजेति सर्वथा स्थातव्यमस्य नियोगे ।
—ह० च०, अ० उच्छ०, पृ० ८५ ।

65. *Ibid.*, *P.* 258. इयं नःस्वसा बाला च बहुदुःखखेदिता च सर्वकार्यावधीरणोपरोधेनापि यावल्लालनीया नित्यम् । अस्माभिश्च भ्रातृवधापकारिरिपुकुलप्रलयकरणोद्यतस्य बाहोर्विधेयर्भूत्वा सकललोकप्रत्यक्षं प्रतिज्ञा कृता । —ह० च०, अ० उच्छ०, पृ० ८५ ।

66. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 258.

67. *Ibid.*, *P.* 258.

At this point Bāṇa brings his historical romance to an unexpected close and this abrupt ending has deprived us of many other important and valuable informations of political nature.

HARṢA AND ŚAŚĀṄKA

Neither Bāṇa nor Yuan Chwang makes a record of the result of Harṣa's expedition against Śaśāṅka, "the most important of Harṣa's campaigns."[68] What we learn from Bāṇa is that Harṣa entrusted Bhaṇḍi with the command of his royal forces ready to punish Śaśāṅka and he himself left in search of his sister Rājyaśrī.

The learned editors have drawn our attention to a passage in Harṣacharita which throws some light on this campaign in an allusive and allegorical manner. This passage runs as follows. "My lord Harṣa also bathed and reclined in silence by his side, stretched on a blanket laid upon the ground. Glancing ever and anon upon his afflicted elder brother, he felt his heart almost split into a thousand parts. For the sight of a brother is a rejuvenescence of sorrow. To the people that day was terrible even beyond the day of their king's death. Throughout the city none cooked, none bathed, none took their pleasure; in every quarter there was no man but wept. Not otherwise did the day pass by. At length, hued like flesh moistened by a great flow of blood as if he had just been shaped by Twastri's axe the sun sank, red as madder, in the waters of the western sea. On the (*red*) lotus ponds the bee tribes buzzed in distress at the closing of the calies. Anguished by the grief of their spouses at their approaching separation, a horizon of ruddy-geese fixed a tearful gaze upon their dear friend, the sun's orb, now hued like a blooming Bandhūka. Musical with bees, graced by kalahaṁsa beauties, the (*night*) lotus pools gave forth a sound like the plaited bells upon the jewelled girdle of the roaming Śrī. In the firmament the rising clear-flecked moon shone like the pointed hump of Śiva's tame bull, when blotted with mud scattered by his broad horns."[69]

---

68. *Harṣa*, *P.* 29.

69. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 168 देवोऽपि हर्षस्तथैव स्नात्वा धरणितलनिहितकुथास्तरणनिसृवि-

They (*the editors*) point out that "Śrī, the goddess of sovereignty, is roaming, not yet settled with a new king."[70] They rightly observe that the "paragraph contains several significant allusions (*'the pathetic fallacy'*) The red sunset is a sign of bloody wars; the separation of the ruddy-geese of the separation of the brothers; the buzzing bees of arrows; the rise of the blotted moon of the rising power of the Gauḍa king." The editors emphasize, "The last is important as the word used for the moon (*Śaśāṅka*) confirms the commentator's statement that this was the Gauḍa king's name."[71] At other places in the Harṣacharita we learn of him as the "Gauḍa king."

We learn that elaborate preparations were made against this Gauḍa king before Harṣa took his historic march. But we do not know anything about his engagement with Śaśāṅka, except "the red sunset" as

---

रदूर एवास्य तूष्णीमेव समवातिष्ठत । द्रष्ट्वा द्रष्ट्वा द्रूयमानमानसमभजन्मानं समस्फुटविवास्य सहस्रधा हृदयम्। आरसदर्शनं हि यौवनं शोकस्य। लोकस्य तु नरपतिमरणदिवसादपि दारुण: स बभूव दिवस: । सर्वस्मिन्नेव नगरे न केनचिदपाचि न केनचिदस्नायि नाभोजि सर्वत्र सर्वेणारोदि। केवलमनेन क्रमेणातिचक्राम दिवस: । स च प्रत्यग्त्व ट तष्टतनुरिव बहुबदहलरुधिररसमास-च्छविरपर पारावारपयसि ममज्ज मंजिष्ठारुणोऽरुणसारथि:। मुकुलायमानकमलिनीकोषविलं चकाण चचरीककुल कमलसरसि । सविर्वाधरहव्याधिविधुरवधूबाध्यमानं बबन्ध बन्धाविव विबुद्धबन्धूकभासि भास्वति मास्त्रा दृश चक्रवाकचक्रवालम्। सचरन्त्या. समधुकररवं कैरवाकरं कलहमररमणीरमणीय माणिक्यकाचीकिंकिणीजालमिवाण श्रिय । प्रकटकलकमुदयमान विसंकट-विषाणोत्कीर्णपकसकरशकरशकुरशक्करककुदकूटमकाशमकाशताकाशे शशाकमण्डलम्।

—ह० च०, ष० उच्छ्०, पृ० ३८ ।

70. *HCCTH., Appendix B, P* 275.

71. *Ibid., P.* 275; *Buhler has drawn our attention to one MSS. of Harṣacharita wherein Gauḍa king is named as Narendragupta. Ep. Ind., Vol. I., P.* 70. *But it is an established fact that the name of the Gauḍa king was Śaśāṅka. It appears that he might have also been known as Narendragupta. Several Indian monarchs assumed more than one name. That the king of Karṇasuvarṇa (Kie-lo-na-su-fa-la-na) was Śaśāṅka (She-shang-kia) is known on the basis of unimpeachable evidences. CII., Vol. III, Pp.* 283-84; *Cat. Coins. Br. Mus., Nos.* 606 *to* 612, *Pp.* 147-48; *Cat. Co. Ind. Mus., Vol. I, Nos.* 1-8, *Pp.* 121-122; *Beal, I, Pp.* 210*f. Watters, Vol. II, Pp.* 43*f.*

a symbol of "bloody wars." It makes it clear that Harṣa's immediate task was to punish Śaśāṅka, but his deep love for his younger sister forced him to prefer her recovery to the "pursuit of his brother's murderer."[72] The "recovery of his widowed sister," writes Smith, "being the more urgent, was undertaken in all haste, even at the cost of permitting the assassin's escape." To him "it seems clear that he (*Śaśāṅka*) escaped with little loss."[73]

Śaśāṅka, according to C. V. Vaidya, "saved himself by another stroke of policy in much the same way as he had saved himself from Rājyavardhana," and "perhaps Harṣa, in his Buddhistic tendencies extended forgiveness to Śaśānka and did not exact from him the threatened reparation for murder."[74]

Shri Vaidy's contention has some weight as we learn that Harsa was somewhat influenced by Buddhistic spirit of non-voilence in his later years; but the immediate consequences of his mission against Śaśānka are to be explained a little more satisfactorily. Shri Vaidya does not make it clear what he wants to convey "by another storke of policy." When we discuss Harṣa's campaign against Śaśānka, we must remember that Harṣa heard the news of his elder brother's treacherous murder with "flashes of furious wrath," and with "quivering without cessation and with his reddening eyes," he thundered against the Gauḍa king. The latter was like "a cruel thorn" in Harṣa's heart and he was determined to see the "smoke cloud from the vilest of the Gauḍas' pyre." His solemn vow that he took "by the dust of his honoured lord's feet"...."to clear the earth of the Gauḍas in a limited number of days." If failed he would "hurl his sinful self, like a moth, into an oilfed flame." Later, in the presence of a great Buddhist mendicant Divākaramitra at his hermitage, where Rājyśrī expressed her "desire to assume red robe," Harṣa again reiterated his solemn vow before Bhadanta Divākaramitra that he "made a vow in the presence of all the world....to destroy the insolent enemies who had

72. *EHI.*, *4th Ed.*, *Pp.* 351-52.
73. *Ibid.*, *P.* 352.
74. *HMHI.*, *Vol. I*, *P.* 11.

slain my brother " He was "unable to endure the insult" done to him by these enemies and had "surrendered his whole soul to offer righteous vengeance ' Harsa told the sage, From this day forth, while I discharge my vow and console my subjects in their sorrow for my father's death, I desire that she should remain at my side At the end, when I have accomplished my design she and I will assume the red garments together "[75]

This statement of Harsa makes it clear that he did not enjoy any such idea of extending forgiveness to Śaśanka " It was in the presence of a Buddhist sage that he repeated his vow time and again and that he was firmly determined to righteous vengeance ' [76]

According to Pannikar, Śaśanka accepted Harsa's suzerainty and was allowed by him to rule his state as a vassal '

N Ray also treats the Rohtasgarh seal to have been inscribed after the defeat of Śaśanka by the joint attack of Bhandi and Bhāskaravarman [77] It is also opined that Śaśanka had to surrender some part of his territory to Harsa Had it not been so the learned scholar opines, it is not possible to account for the continued survival of Śaśanka as king of Gauda [78]

To me it appears that Dr R S Tripathi has offered a more rational and acceptable explanation He opines that the forces of Harṣa and Śaśanka did not involve in any active military operation According to the learned scholar, Śaśanka, on the approach of Harṣa's army thought discretion was the better part of valour, and instead of facing an open conflict he withdrew from Kanauj, as after the conclusion of treaty between Harsa and Bhaskaravarmana he was exposed to serious danger both from

---

75 *HCCTH*, *Pp* 257 8, अद्यप्रभृति यावदय जनो लघयति प्रतिज्ञाभारमाश्वासयति च तातविनाशदु खविक्लवा प्रजा तावदिमामत्रभवत कथाभिश्च धर्म्याभि, कुशलप्रतिबोधविधायिभिरुपदेशैश्चारजोभि, शीलोपशमदायिनीभिश्च देशनाभि, क्लेशप्रहाणहेतुभूतैश्च तथागतदर्शनै, अस्मत्पार्श्वे पियायिनीमेव प्रतिबोध्यमानामिच्छामि। इय तु ग्रहीष्यति मयैव सम समाप्तकृत्येन काषायाणि। —ह० च०, अ० उच्छ०, पृ० ८५।

76 *Sri Harṣa of Kanauj*, *Pp* 17*f*

77 *Cal Rev*, 1923, *Pp* 207*f*

78. *IHQ.*, *Vol. XII*, *Pp* 142-3

the front and the rear. Baṇḍi had already cut off the support of the Mālvā army after the defeat and death of its leader, and in the face of the new odds arrayed against Śaśāṅka strategy certainly demanded that he should beat a masterly retreat."[79]

Dr. Majumdar,[80] however, does not agree with Smith, Vaidya and Tripathi. According to him, Dr. Tripathi's attempt "has hardly anything to commend it," and his "graphic picture," he tells us, "is a mere gratuitous assumption."[81] But Dr. Majumdar does not offer any explanation as to why this so-called "first great emperor of Bengal" (Śaśāṅka) did not face Harṣa in an open battle. Śaśāṅka was not only utterly demoralised by his black deed,[82] but was also extremely weakened and, therefore, escaped from the scene to save his life. His resort to murder[83] Rājyavardhana with treacherous designs can only be termed as a desperate action and it reflects on his inherent weakness. And we must agree to the view that Śaśāṅka "beat a masterly retreat."

But what surprises the impartial researcher more is Dr. Majumdar's attempt at criticizing Dr. Tripathi's hypothesis as "gratuitous assumption" which, according to him, "has hardly anything to commend it", and his putting forward a more gratuitous assumption that "Śaśāṅka might have left the younger brother of Grahavarman on the throne of Kanauj as his own protege, and it was by ousting him that Harṣa occupied Kanauj after Śaśāṅka had retired to his kingdom."[84]

On the grounds of numismatic evidence Basaka feels that Śaśāṅka

---

79. *THK.*, *Pp.* 73-74.

80. *CA.*, *Pp.* 102-3.

81. *Ibid.*, *P.* 102.

82. *Prabāsī*, *Āśvin*, 1339, *V. S. XXXII*, *Pp.* 742-49.

83. *It is also argued that "Rājyavardhana lost his life in the encounter" and was killed by king of Gauḍa who was probably an ally of Śaśāṅka. IHQ.*, *Vol. XXIII.*, 1942, *Pp.* 51*f*. *Such conclusions are not only baseless but also appear as absurd in light of definite knowledge that Rājyavardhana was killed treacherously.*

84. *CA.*, *P.* 102.

was defeated by Harṣa as "the gold coins which were largely debased by a great mixture of silver."[85]

we do not rule out the possibility that Avantivarman had more than one son,[86] but Dr. Majumdar has overlooked the fact that another son (?) of Avantivaraman, known to ussofar, mo st probably, enjoyed the titles like Para(*mamāheśvara*) (*mahā*)rājā(*dhi*)rājā[87] whereas Śaśāṅka was known as Mahāsāmanta, a very insignificant title if considered politically. This title shows that he must have been a chief of a district[88] or was a mere feudatory.[89] According to Dr. Ganguli, he was a feudatory of the Maukharis.[91] We admit that the rise of Śaśāṅka was rapid, but we cannot admit that his overlord became his 'protege' so soon.

Secondly, the Maukhari dynasty does not offer any such parallel example of a prince thirsty for his own brother's blood and playing in the hands of Śaśāṅka and getting the throne of Kanauj after his own brother's treacherous murder and imprisoning his sister-in-law.

Yuan Chwang and Bāṇa do not give any hint of such an event. It we admit that Grahavaraman's brother was living by that time and was ruling over Magadha, he must have been the first victim of Śaśāṅka's unscrupulous designs. Moreover, if Grahavarman's brother was living, Rājyaśrī should have welcomed him for the throne. Both Bāṇa and Yuan Chwang record that neither Harṣa nor Rājyaśrī had any lust for power.

We must note that the success of Śaśāṇka against Grahavarman

---

85. *IHQ.*, *Vol. VIII, P.* 150.

86. *His another son was Sucha or Suva, who appears to have succeeded Avantivarman in Magadha. The problem of succession after Avantivarman is discussed in detail in the present thesis. Supra, Chapter I, footnote* 96.

87. *Ep. Ind.*, *XXIV.*, *Pp.* 284*f.*

88. *CII.*, *Vol. III.*, *No.* 78, *Pp.* 283-84.

89. *Ibid.*, *P.* 284, *footnote* 1.

90. *DKM.*, *P.* 206.

91. *IHQ.*, *XII, Pp.* 256*f. Dr. Majumdar, however, thinks that he* (*Śaśāṅka*) *was serving Mahāsenagupta. History of Bengal, Vol. I, P.* 59.

was more by mischievous plots and bloody designs than by valour. We have seen how 'Śaśāṅka and his allies were conquered by Rājyavardhana and how the latter was murdered treacherously. On Harṣa's arrival, Śaśāṅka had no other alternative than escaping from the scene of his military operation in order to avoid total annihilation. If we accept Dr. Majumdar's contention for a time being that Śaśāṅka "left his protege, and it was by ousting him that Harṣa occupied Kanauj,"[92] it also proves the weakness of Śaśāṅka. Was not the overthrow of his protege a challenge to Śaśāṅka ? And why did the latter could not meet it ? I do not think Dr. Majumdar has any convincing arguments to explain these questions.

The circumstances that forced Harṣa to accept the throne of Kanauj prove that there was nobody on the Kanauj throne till that time and that Śaśāṅka fled away from Kanauj when he expected Harṣa's arrival.

Some scholars[93] have laid much emphasis on a record of Sainyabhīta II Mādhavarāja II, of the Śailodbhava dynasty, of the year 619-20 A.D.[94] which informs us that the Śailodbhava ruler was feudatory of Śaśāṅka. We have to explain the evidence of this record. It appears quite probable that Śaśāṅka might have taken shelter in Orissa after his overthrow from Karṇasuvarṇa, and he might have succeeded in establishing his overlordship in Orissa.[95] But this record does not deserve the importance

92. *CA.*, P. 102.

93. *Ibid.*, *Pp.* 94.

94. *Ep. Ind.*, *Vol. VI*, *Pp.* 143-144.

95. *We must remember that the Nidhānpur Copper plates of Bhāskaravarman were issued from Karṇasuvarṇa* (*Ep. Ind.*, *Vol. XII*, *Pp.* 65*f.*), *and on that ground Barua opines that Harṣa-Bhāskaravarman axis proved fatal to Śaśāṅka. According to him, Bhaṇḍi attacked Śaśāṅka from the west and Bhāskaravarman attacked from the east and occupied Karṇasuvarṇa. As a result of "being defeated from two sides Śaśāṅka fled towards Orissa."* (*Early History of Kāmarūpa*, *Pp.* 65*f*). *R. D. Banerjee also supports such conclusion and says that Śaśāṅka "was eventually driven out of Karṇasuvarṇa" and it is "quite possible that his overthrow took place before* 619-20 *A.D."* (*History of Orissa*, *Vol. I.*, *P.* 129). *Father Heras lends further support to this view.* (*JBBRAS* (*New Services*), *I-II*, *Pp.* 116*f*).

that has been attached to it. We have an evidence to prove that Śaśāṅka's overlordship could not last long as proved by the another record of Sainyabhīta II Mādhavarāja II which does not make any mention of Śaśāṅka's overlordship. It appears almost certain that that record was issued after Śaśāṅka lost his hold over Orissa.

THE EVIDENCE OF ĀRYA MAÑJU ŚRĪ MŪLAKALPA

The only earlier source that throws some light on the results of the expedition against Śaśāṅka is Ārya Mañju Śrī Mūlakalpa. It records that king "Ha (Harṣa)....the powerful Vaiśya king with a large army marched against the eastern country against the capital Puṇḍra of the characterless man. Adopting the duty of Kṣātra with the sense of personal injury and indignation, he, though kind, prone to religion and learned, kills many, becomes an oppressor of living creatures for the reason of being engaged in duty of chatisement....Ha (*Harṣa*) defeated Soma (*Śaśāṅka*), the pursuer of wicked deeds; Soma was forbidden to move out of his country being ordered to remain therein (*henceforth*). He (*Harṣa*) returned, having been honoured (?) in that kingdom of barbarians (*Mlechchhas*). He, as excellent king among followers of 'artha' and 'dharma', was successful in his undertakings."[96]

This passage has been variably interpreted by scholars. Dr. Majumdar condemns it outrightly as a "vague and obscure statement in the Medieval Buddhist Chronicle."[97] Dr. Sinha does not consider it "safe to rely on the evidence of the Ārya Mañju Śrī Mūlakalpa alone for the alleged battle between Harṣa and Śaśāṅka.[98] Even if the information is assumed to be a fact, "the expedition led to no permanent results,"[99] and "Śaśāṅka could not be crushed and was left in possession of his kingdom."[100] But some scholars do not dismiss the evidence of Ārya Mañju Śrī mūlakalpa as

---

96. *Imp. Hist. of Ind.*, *P.* 50; *Sans. text.*, *P.* 53.
97. *CA.*, *P.* 107.
98. *DKM.*, *P.* 256; *Chatterjee*, *Harṣavardhana*, *P.* 186.
99. *CA.*, *P.* 107.
100. *DKM.*, *P.* 256.

altogether baseless. Dr. Jayaswal appears to treat it as a fact.[101] Dr. Sircar also adopts a similar line.[102] He tells us that in the later period of Harṣa's reign "the whole of Bengal lay prostrate at the feet of Harṣa."[103]

Records of Yuan Chwang also support the evidence of Ārya Mañju Śrī Mūlakalpa. He tells us that Śaśāṅka, "the wicked king of Karṇasuvarṇa, a prosecutor of Buddhism". treacherously murdered Rājyavardhana. Harṣa was advised by the Bodhisattva Avolokiteśvara "to raise Buddhism from the ruin into which it had been brought by the king of Karṇasuvarṇa."[105] The pilgrim goes on to say that Harṣa "got together a great army and set out to avenge his brother's murder...Proceeding eastward he invaded the states which had refused allegiance, and waged incessant warfare until in six years he had fought the five Indias."[106] It is also recorded in 'Life' that Harṣa was soon able to avenge the injuries received by his brother."[107] We have already maintained that the accounts of the Ārya Mañju Śrī Mūlakalpa and the records of the pilgrim are our principal

---

101. *Imp. Hist. of Ind., Pp.* 50-51.

102. *IHQ., Vol. XIX,* 1944, *P.* 280.

103. *Ibid., P.* 280.

104. *Watters, I., P.* 343. *He refers to Śaśāṅka's brutal conduct.* "*By Śaśāṅka's extermination of Buddhism the groups of Brothern*", *at several places,* "*were all broken up....*" *Ibid., II, P.* 92. "*In recent times king Śaśāṅka having tried in vain to efface the footprints caused the stone (with Buddha's footprints) to be thrown into the Ganges.*" "*But it is said to have returned to its original place.*" *Ibid., Vol. II, P.* 43. *Referring to him the pilgrim tells us,* "*In recent times, Śaśāṅka, the enemy and oppressor of Buddhism cut down the Bodhi tree, destroyed its roots down to the water, and burned what remained.*" *The pilgrim informs that a few months afterwards Puṇyavarman, the last descendant of Aśoka brought the tree back to life. Ibid II, P.* 115. *Śaśāṅka is also said to have* "*removed the images of Buddha and replaced it by one of Śiva.*' *Ibid., II, P.* 116.

105. *Ibid., I, P.* 343.

106. *Ibid., I, P.* 343. *According to another reading, he* "*had brought the five Indias under allegiance*". *Ibid., I, P.* 343.

107. *Beal., Life. P.* 83.

Buddhist sources and we can not dismiss them only on the ground that they are Buddhist. Dr. Sinha does not feel that "Śaśāṅka was thoroughly defeated by Harṣa."[108] One may also feel that we have nothing to prove that the accounts of Ārya Mañju Śrī Mūlakalpa and those of the Chinese pilgrim are baseless. The Pilgrim has recorded many superfluous things, but he can not be dubbed as an unscrupulous narrator. I submit that Śaśāṅka did not face Harṣa's forces at Kanauj and as Dr. Tripathi maintains, he left the field without any contest.

After Harṣa consolidated his position, he invaded Śaśāṅka. The latter, as Ārya Mañju Śrī Mūlakalpa records, was defeated and contented himself with his overlordship over Kaliṅga about 619-20 A.D.. The pilgrim refers to Śaśāṅka's misdeeds which are said to have been committed "in recent times."[109] And we know that the pilgrim toured Magadha about 637 A.D.. This makes it quite certain that Śaśāṅka died before this date and the narrative clearly points out that his misdeeds and death were in living memory of the people of Magadha.

According to Ārya Mañju Śrī Mūlakalpa he ruled for seventeen years, one month and seven days.[110] Thus his death must have taken place after 619-20 A.D., the date of the Ganjām plates of Mādhavarāja II and before 637 A.D.. This conclusion is further confirmed by undated Khurda plates of Mādhavarāja II which does not refer to Śaśāṅka as his overlord and thus Mādhavarāja II was the sole ruler of Kaliṅga some time after 619-20 A.D.. Thus if we accept Śaśāṅka's accession about 603-4 A.D. and assuming that the reign period assigned to Śaśāṅka in the Ārya Mañju Śrī Mūlakalpa is correct, he must have died about 621-622 A.D..

Political anarchy and chaotic conditions that followed Śaśāṅka's death[111] prove that Śaśāṅka did not leave any permanent mark of his personality on administrative set-up. We feel that his political achieve-

108. *DKM.*, P. 257.
109. *Watters.*, *II.*, *Pp.* 92, 115.
110. *Imp. History of India*, P. 50.
111. *Ibid.*, P. 51-52.

ments were almost undone with his death and "Bengal lay prostrate at the feet of Harṣa."[112] Orissa was also subjugated by Harṣa as we shall see later.

HARṢA'S ACCEPTANCE OF THE KANAUJ THRONE

We have seen how Bāṇa ends his narrative abruptly at a stage when Harṣa reached his camp on the bank of the Gaṅgā soon after he found his sister Rājyaśrī. But it is really surprising to note that Bāṇa does not refer to Kānyakubja, a great centre of politics, trade and culture in those days. It becomes all the more puzzling when we go through his description Śrīkaṇṭha Janapada with its capital at Sthāneśvara with the minutest details. Only two explanations can be offered for it.

Firstly, Bāṇa could only write his patron's biography till Rājyaśrī's recovery and ends it at that point, or he, like his another work Kādambarī, could not complete this work. His son would have thought it better to complete the unfinished tale of Kādambarī, leaving Harṣacharita as it was.

Secondly, this can also be explained, in a way, that Bāṇa like many others and, in accordance with the traditions of our country, did not find proper justification for his patron's action of taking over under his active control the kingdom of Kanauj which rightfully belonged to his younger sister. To avoid this embarrassment he would have thought it better to end the story at a point he thought appropriate.

And thirdly, Bāṇa might have not been able to complete his work properly or might have died leaving it unfinished. His son Bhūṣaṇa might have thought Kādambarī to be preferred to Harṣacharita. These are purely tentative hypotheses and we cannot say anything definitely.

Yuan Chwang, who tells us much about Harṣa's later life, does not refer to his association with Thāneśvara. He only writes about Kanauj. It is, perhaps, because he visited Kanauj when it was ruled by Harṣa. He tells us that after Rājyavardhana was "treacherously murdered"

112. *IHQ.*, *Vol. XIX*, 1943, *Pp.* 280.

by Śaśāṅka, "the statesmen of Kanauj on the advice of their leading man Bani (*or Vani*),[113] invited Harṣavardhana, the younger brother of the murdered king, to become their sovereign. The prince modestly made excuses, and seemed unwilling to comply with their request. When the ministers of state pressed Harṣavardhana "to succeed his brother and avenge his murder," the narrative goes on to relate, "the prince determined to take the advice of the Bodhisattva Avalokiteśvara"...."After due fasting and prayer, he stated his case to the Bodhisattva. An answer was graciously given which told the prince that it was his good Karma to become king, and that he should, accordingly, accept the offered sovereignty and then raise Buddhism from the ruin into which it had been brought by the king of Karṇasuvarṇa, and afterwards make himself a great kingdom. The Bodhisattava promised him secret help, but warned him not to occupy the actual throne and not to use the title mahārāja. There upon Harṣavardhana became king of Kanauj with the title Rājputra and the style Śīlāditya."[114]

Shri Vaidya has examined the statement of Yuan Chwang and has maintained that "the account relates to what happened subsequently at Kanauj" and "does not relate to what had already happened at Thāneśvara."[115] All accounts at our disposal prove Vaidya's conclusions as correct. About Thāneśvara throne we have seen how Harṣa was selected for the throne and how the two brothers dealt with the affairs of the state. In fact both of them were preparing to assume the bark-dress of an ascetic. But the sequence of events compelled them to renounce the path of renunciation and they had to take up arms immediately.

We have also seen that Rājyavardhana became the king of Thāneśvara and assumed full royal titles. After his death Harṣa became

113. *According to Hoernle Bani may be identified with Bhaṇḍi. JRAS.,* 1903, *P.* 560. *Dr. Mukherjee appears to have taken it for granted. Harṣa, P.* 17, *footnote* 1. *But Dr. Tripathi says that there is hardly any justification for it. THK., p.* 75. *footnote* 1.

114. *Watters., Vol. I., P.* 343; *Beal, Vol. I, p.* 211.

115. *HMHI., I, p.* 7.

king. Harṣacharita does not refer to Rājyavardhana's marriage and it indicates that Rājyavardhana was not married till that time.[116] If married, he left no issue to succeed. The events took place in a very rapid succession and it is quite certain that he was not married at all. There was no other claimant also. This we also learn from Harṣa's conversation with Divākaramitra. The former says to the latter that he was in utter distress for he had "only one young sister left," who was "the sole link" that kept up his life, "now that I have lost all my loved kindred."[117] We are also told by Bāṇa that Harṣa not only accepted the crown but he was also consecrated as the king with complete coronation rites.[118] Therefore, we have no reason to apply Yuan Chwang's description to the Thāneśvara throne. The pilgrim's reference, therefore, is certainly to the throne of Kanauj.

Yuan Chwang's accounts, however, indicate to "some anxious deliberations" which were there "to the disposal of that kingdom."[119] Harṣa accepted the offer and took over the kingdom of Kanauj. The "fondest attachment" and "religious sentiment" between Harṣa and Rājyaśrī formed the basis of "their amicable relations." This is further proved by the testimony of another Chinese record. Fang-chih informs us that Harṣa was "administering the government in conjunction with his widowed sister."[120] This statement has been accepted by many scholars who opine that Harṣa acted as "Regent" or "Guardian."[121] It

---

116. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 253; *HMHI.*, *I*, *P.* 7.

117. *HCCTH.* *p.* 240; मम हि विनष्टनिखिलेष्टबन्धोर्जीवितानुबन्धस्य निबन्धनमेकव यवीयसी स्वसावशेषा। —ह० च०, अ० उच्छ०, पृ० ७५।

118. *HCCTH.*, *Pp.* 197*f.*

119. *HMHI.*, *I.*, *P.* 8.

120. *Such information, according to Watters, "is not either in the 'Life' or the 'Records'."* *Watters*, *I*, *P.* 345. *EHI.*, *4th Ed.*, *P.* 351; *THK.*, *P.* 76.

121. *EHI.*, *4th Ed.*, *P.* 351; *HMHI.*, *I*, *Pp.* 8-9; *Ray*, *IHQ.*, 1927, *P.* 773; *THK.*, *Pp.* 76*f.* *But according to Dr. R. C. Majumdar, it is "confused and absurd." He tells us that another son of Avantivarman ruled after Grahavarman's death and it was "by ousting him Harṣa occupied the throne of Kanauj."* *CA.*, *Pp.* 100*ff.*

was only after he had subdued the enemies fully and consolidated his position both at Thānеśvara and Kanauj, he appears to have transferred his seat of Government from Thāneśvara to Kanauj.[122] But this would not have happened against the interest of his sister. On the other hand, it is possible that Harṣa might have done so in deference to her sister's wishes. Both of them lived with "fondest bonds." Rājyaśrī enjoyed a highly esteemed and respectful place in Harṣa's court. We learn from Yuan Chwang that she was present as a listener seated behind Harṣavardhana when the Chinese pilgrim gave a lecture on Buddhism.[123]

This unification of the two powerful kingdoms of Thāneśvara and Kanuaj made Harṣa the most powerful king of the Northern India. His power and prestige were further enhanced when he enlarged his territorial jurisdiction and sphere of influence by his several wars and conquests which we propose to discuss in the next chapter.

---

122. *THK., P.* 77.

123. *Watters., Vol. I. P.* 345,

CHAPTER V

WARS AND CONQUESTS

Our sources throwing light on Harṣa's several other wars and conquests like that of his expedition against Śaśāṅka, are very meagre and inadequate and it is very difficult to ascertain his political and military achievements in a well-established chronological order. We have seen that Bāṇa ends his Harṣacharita abruptly and what Yuan Chwang writes is also full of confusions and many misleading descriptions. Harṣa's inscriptions and other contemporary records are also of a little help to us regarding his political history. We, therefore, propose to examine all these sources and reconstruct the sequence of events of his political and military career as far as possible.

TESTIMONY OF BĀṆA

Bāṇa introduces to his readers Kṛiṣṇa as the brother of "Śrīharṣa, the king of kings, the lord of four occeans whose toenails are burnished by the crest jems of all other monarchs, the leader of all emperors."[1] To him "no reign has been stainless except that of Harṣa, king of kings, sovereign of all continents."[2]

Puṣpabhūti, the progenitor of the line of Puṣpabhūtis, we are told, was blessed by the goddess at the cemetery that he would be "a founder of a mighty line." In that line "shall arise an emperor named Harṣa,

---

1. *HCCTH.*, *p.* 40; "देवस्य चतुःसमुद्राधिपतेः सकलराजचक्रचूडामणिश्रेणीशाणकोणकषणनिर्मलीकृतचरणनखमणेः सर्वचक्रवर्तिनां धौरेयस्य महाराजाधिराजपरमेश्वरश्रीहर्षदेवस्य।" —ह० च०, तृ० उच्छ्०, पृ० २३।

2. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 75; "इत्थं नास्ति राजत्वमपकलङ्कमृते देवदेवादमुतः सर्वद्वीपभुजो हर्षात्।" —ह० च०, तृ० उच्छ्०, पृ० ४०।

governor like Hariśchandra of all the continents, world-conquering like a second Māndhātri."[3]

Bāṇa also records very minutely the details of elaborate preparations of Harṣa's forces for the march against enemies.[4] But he does not throw enough light on Harṣa's plans for digvijaya. His sudden and abrupt ending of Harṣacharita has deprived us of further description. A passage in the Harṣacharita, however, is of some singificance to us regarding Harṣa's political gains.

If we look into the reference and context of this passage it appears to be an important one. It seems that the passage in question records the achievements of Harṣa as known to the common man during his times. When Bāṇa, after visiting Harṣa's court, went back to his Brāhmaṇa settlement (*adhivāsaṁ*), all his kinsmen and friends assembled to welcome him. They wished to hear from him the accounts of his visit to Harṣa's court. At a signal from them, Śyāmala, the youngest of his cousins, respectfully spoke to Bāṇa that "no reign had been stainless except that of Harṣa, the king of kings, sovereign of all continents."[5] He hastened to add that "many marvels (*bahūnyāścharyāṇi*) are reported (*śrūyante*) concerning him[6] and then he relates these marvels.

Thus it becomes clear that Bāṇa put this entire description of Harṣa's achievements in the mouth of Śyāmala, who narrated them as if they were commonly known to the people in those days. Now we shall see the political significance of these marvels.

1. Harṣa, according Śyāmala, "was known as 'the conqueror by force',[7] who made the several kings, their allies or supporters being cut-off, immovable," (*in their kingdoms*).[8] Bāṇa was the greatest master of

---

3. *HCCTH., P.* 97. यस्मिन्नुत्पत्स्यते सर्वद्वीपानां भोक्ता हरिश्चन्द्र इव हर्षनामा चक्रवर्ती त्रिभुवनविजिगीषुर्द्वितीयो मान्धातेव। —ह० च०, तृ० उच्छ्०, पृ० ५४।
4. *HCCTH., PP.* 177*ff.*
5. *HCCTH., P.* 74.
6. *HCCTH., P.* 75.
7. *Also 'Indra'. HCCTH., P.* 75, *footnote* 12.
8. अत्र बलजिता निश्चलीकृताश्चलन्तः कृतपक्षाः क्षितिभृतः।
—ह० च०, तृ० उच्छ्०, पृ० ४०।

the Sanskrit language and, therefore, his language is full of puns. This may also mean that "an Indra (*Balajita*) has fixed fast the winged mountains." But the pun does not appear to have been applied here. And, therefore, the reference in question appears to refer to Harṣa's military exploits and successes in quelling the enemies. Harṣa's engagements with several rulers and his success in subduing them appear to have been commonly known. This is in consonance with the policy as laid down in the treatises on ancient Indian polity.

2. "He, the lord of all people, pardoned (*and allowed*) to rule all kings and chieftains."[9] This may justly apply to Harṣa. It is in tune with the spirit of Harṣa's political ideals. Like Samudragupta, he might have pursued such a course of policy and allowed his conquered adversaries to rule after being satisfied with the recognition of his over-lordship.

Ancient Indian History offers many such examples when victorious monarchs allowed the defeated kings to rule over their respective territories. Shrī Chatterjee has offered a very good example of king Raghu, the great righteous (*Dharmavijayī*) king who took away Indra's glory (*Śrī*) but allowed him to rule over the earth.[10] Indian history is full of such examples.

3. "He, the greatest of all men, having conquered the king of Sindha, made his wealth his own."[11] We know that Harṣa's father, Prabhākaravardhana, is said to be "a burning fever to the king of Sindha" (*Sindhurājajvaro*), and, probably, the king of Sindhu and Harṣa might

---

I have adopted here the translation as done by Sri C. V. Vaidya. HMHI., I, P. 43; HCCTH., Pp. 75-76.

9. अत्र प्रजापतिना शेषभोगिमण्डलस्योपरि क्षमा कृता। *or "a Prajāpati has set the earth upon the hoods of the serpent Śeṣa. HCCTH., P. 76, fn. 1.*

10. "गृहीतप्रतिमुक्तस्य स धर्मविजयी नृपः श्रियं महेन्द्रनाथस्य जहार न तु मेदिनीम्।"
—रघु०, सर्ग ४, श्लोक ४६।
cited in Gaurishanker Chatterjee's Harṣavardhana., P. 101.

11. अत्र पुरुषोत्तमेन सिन्धुराजं प्रमथ्य लक्ष्मीरात्मीकृता। *or a Puruṣottama has obtained Lakshmi by churning the ocean." HCCTH., P. 76. fn. 2.*

have also come to a clash sometime after the death of Prabhākaravardhana and in that fight Harṣa might not only have conquered him but also got enough wealth or booty or indemnity.

4. "He, of great physical strength, let off the great elephant[12] after having released from its trunk the king[13] (*Kumāra*)."[14] The commentator of the Harṣacharita explains this reference to Harṣa's feat by narrating a legend that the Kumārarājā was once caught by Darśapāta, the riding elephant of Harṣa. The elephant encircled the prince in his trunk. On that occasion Harṣa showed great personal physical power and courage and cut off the trunk of the elephant and liberated the prince. The elephant was then let loose into the jungles.[15] This must have happened when Kumāra[16] visited Harṣa. But this incident might have taken place after Bāṇa's visit to Harṣa's camp. We find that Bāṇa gives a graphic picture of Darśapāta, but he does not talk of any such incident. Therefore, it appears that the incident might have taken place after Bāṇa left the camp and the elephant Darśapāta might have been let loose into the woods.

5. "He, the great emperor, anointed Kumāra a king."[17] According to Vaidya, "the king anointed by him must be the Kumārarājā of Assam,

---

12. *'Darśapāta' was the name of the elephant. HCCTH., P. 76, fn 4.*

13. *King Śrikumāra or Kumāra. Harṣa is said to have rescued him when the latter "was encircled in the trunk of a mad elephant," which "was let loose" in the forest. HCCTH., P. 76, fn. 3. The editors of the Harṣacharita tell us that the king's name was Śrikumāra or Kumāra Gupta. I do not know how they refer to Kumāra Gupta. It appears that they have referred to one of the sons of Mahāsenagupta.*

14. अत्र बलिना मोचितमूभृद्वेष्टनो मुक्तो महानागः।—हृ० च०, तृ० उच्छ०, पृ० ४० । *Or "Bali has set free the encircled mountain and loosened a great serpent (Vāsuki)." HCCTH., P. 76, fn. 3; Gaurishanker Chatterjee, Harṣavardhana, P. 101.*

15. *HMHI., Vol. I., P. 44.*

16. *Kumāra is generally identified with king Bhāsakaravarman of Kāmarūpa.*

17. "अत्र देवेनाभिषक्तः कुमारः।" *HCK. Canto 3, P. 40; HCCTH., P. 76.*

whom, perhaps, being his first ally and willing friend he raised to a high dignity by crowning him himself."[18] He further suggests that he might have also given him the kingdom of Śaśāṅka which he conquered.[19] This appears to be more probable if we take into consideration the circumstances underlying Harṣa-Kumāra alliance. It was Śaśāṅka who was a common enemy to both of them and, probably, after quelling Śaśāṅka Harṣa might have entrusted the administration of the distant territories of the Gauḍas to Kumāra (*Bhāskaravarman*).

The learned editors of the Harṣacharita have also pointed out that Kumāra may also stand for the god of war or for Harsa's young son.[20] If we accept that Kumāra stands for the god of war, we get an evidence of Harsa's constant engagement in wars. But we have no evidence to prove that it refers to Harsa's anointing his young son.

6. "He, the master, signalised his power by laying low his enemy at one stroke "[21] This is a general praise and we cannot say to which of Harṣa's campaigns it refers to as Harsa won many battles single-handed. But it can be said quite safely that it is not a mere boast.

7. "He, a man-lion, has manifested his might by cutting down his enemy with his own hand."[22] Like the preceding references this also refers to Harsa's success in a conventional manner. But this is not a baseless claim as we know that Harṣa led his armies personally and there is no reason to disbelieve it that he killed his enemy with his own hand. In one of the various engagements Harṣa might have slain his enemy with his own hand.

---

18. *HMHI. Vol. I, P.* 44.

19. *Ibid., P.* 44.

20. *HCCTH., P.* 76, *fn.* 5. *This is based on Śaṅkara's commentary on Harṣacharita.*

21. *Ibid., P.* 76.

22. "अत्र नरसिंहेन स्वहस्तविशसितारातिना प्रकटीकृतो विक्रमः।
—ह० च०, तृ० उ०, पृ० ४० ।
HCCTH., P. 76. *The learned editors draw our attention to a pun here on "Arāti, king of demons, slain by Kumāra."* *Ibid., P.* 76, *fn.* 6.

8. "He, the supreme lord, exacted tribute from the inaccessible land of the snowy mountains (*the Himālayas*)."[23] According to Dr. Mookerji, it may refer to Kashmir.[24] Śrī Vaidya opines that it may correspond both to Kashmir or to perhaps Nepāl.[25] Chatterjee thinks it better to understand by Bāṇa's reference some inaccessible land in modern Garhvāl region.[26]

9. "He, the protector of all peoples, appointed protectors and governors of peoples in the several directions."[27] Śrī Vaidya maintains that the reference to governors or viceroys is significant. Harṣa must have appointed these officials throughout the kingdom "to collect tribute and to maintain law and order" in all directions.[28]

YUAN CHWANG ON HARṢA'S CONQUESTS

Like Bāṇa, Yuan Chwang also deals with Harṣa's wars and military expeditions in a vague and general manner,[29] and sometimes makes the confusion worse confounded. He tells us that "as soon as Śīlāditya became ruler he got together a great army, and set out to avenge his brother's murder and to reduce the neighbouring countries to subjection. Proceeding eastwards he invaded the states which had refused allegiance, and waged incessant warfare until in six years he had fought the Five Indias. Then having enlarged his territory he increased his

---

23. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 76; अत्र परमेश्वरेण तुषारशैलभुवो दुर्गाया गृहीतः करः।
—ह० च०, तृ० उ०, पृ० ४०।

24. *Harṣa*, *P.* 40.

25. *HMHI.*, *I.*, *P.* 43. *This may find some further support from Harṣa era being in vogue in Nepāl for which reference will be made later.*

26. *Gauri Shanker Chatterjee*, *Harṣavardhana*, *Pp.* 102-3.

27. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 76. अत्र लोकनाथेन दिशां मुखेषु परिकल्पिता लोकपालाः।

28. *HMHI.*, *I.*, *p.* 44. *The French statesman Richlieu maintained such officials who were the eyes of Government. As a wise ruler Harṣa might have understood the utility of appointing these officers to strengthen his administration.*

29. *CA.*, *P.* 103.

army, bringing the elephant corps up to 60,000 and the cavalry to 100,000 and reigned in peace for thirty years without raising a weapon."[30]

This passage is also of a little help to us in our study of Harṣa's wars and conquests. But our other sources, too, are meagre and poor. Dr. Mookerjee[31] and Shrī Chatterjee[32] have also drawn our attention to Harṣa's dramas wherein we get some information pertaining to political conditions in those times. Ratnāvalī records a war between the kings of Kośala and Kauśāmbī and the Priyadarśikā refers to wars between Kauśāmbī and Kaliṅga and between Kauśāmbī and the Vindhyan king. The dramas centre round the hero, king Udayana of Vatsa and it is probable that Harṣa might have attempted to relate his own achievements in these dramas as we learn that almost all these territories were under Harṣa's possession which appears to have been acquired by Harṣa himself.

With these facts in view I propose to discuss Harṣa's military campaigns and achievements as also known from other contemporary sources and shall try to see how far they are corroborated by these evidences of Bāṇa and Yuan Chwang.

HARṢA'S CONQUEST OVER VALABHI

We have seen how the Valabhī kingdom was founded by Bhaṭāraka and how it gradually gained ground under Dharasena I (c..A.D. 493-499), Droṇasiṁha (c.A.D. 499-519), Dhurvasena I (c.A.D. 569-590) and Śīlāditya I (c.A.D. 590-615). The latter was the first Valabhī ruler who was contemporary to Harṣavardhana. He is supposed to have ruled over a great kingdom extending from Western Coast to Eastern Mālvā[33] and, thus, he appears to be the immediate neighbour of Harṣa.

This period in Indian History had witnessed one of the most serious diplomatic revolutions, political alignments and realignments. Fortunately for Śīlāditya, Prabhākaravardhana was busy at several fronts. In the

---

30. *Watters., I., P.* 343.
31. *Harṣa., P.* 28, *footnote* 2.
32. *Harṣavardhana., P.* 104.
33. *Virji, Anc. Hist. Sau., P.* 47; *Ind. Ant., LXXII, Pp.* 121*ff.*

closing years of his reign Hūṇas arrested his attention. Harṣa, too, during the earlier part of his reign, was busy consolidating his position that was seriously endangered due to Gauḍa-Gupta axis and he could not find time to spare for other ambitious engagements and therefore, Śīlāditya I and his successor, Kharagraha I (c.A.D. 615-621) do not appear to have been disturbed by Harṣa. But soon afterwards Harṣa turned his attention to Western India and the result was a complete success.

Nausari copper plate records an information that "the illustrious Dadda, over whom, with the grace of white cloud, there hung ceaselessly a canopy of glory, gained by protecting (or rescuing ?) the lord of Valabhī, who had been overpowered by the great lord, the illustrious Śrī Harṣadeva."[34]

Now the question before us is to identify this 'lord of Valabhī' who got refuge at the court of Dadda. Yuan Chwang comes here to our help. He says the "reigning sovereign" of 'Fa-la-pi' (Valabhī) "was of Kṣatriya birth, a nephew of Śīlāditya, the former king of Mālvā and a son-in-law of the Śīlāditya reigning at Kānyakubja."[35] His name was Tu-lo-p'o-po-t'a, identified with Dhruvabhatta.[36] The Gurjara king Dadda II, who extended shelter to the Valabhī ruler who had fled after Harṣa's attack, came to throne sometime before c.627-8 A.D. and ruled up to c.A.D. 650 A.D.[37] and, therefore, the conflict between Valabhī and Kānyakubja must have taken place about this time. This makes it clear that the conflict must have taken place between Harṣa and Dhruvasena II. But we cannot rule out the possibility of this war being fought between

---

३४. श्रीहर्षदेवाभिभूतो श्रीवलभीपतिपरित्राणोपजात: भ्रमदभ्रविभ्रमयशोवितान: श्रीदद्द: *Ind. Ant., Vol. XIII*, 1884, *Pp.* 77-81; *JBBRAS., Vol. VI, Pp.* 1*ff*; *Shri G. V. Acharya, Historical Ins. of Gujrat, No.* 117, *Line* 4, *P.*, 40.

35. *Fa-la-p'i is identified with Valabhī. The modern town of Bhāvanagara represents the ancient site of Valabhī. Ancient Geography of India, P.* 317. *This identification, however, is not accepted conclusively.*

36. *Watters., Vol. II, Pp.* 246-47.

37. *Inscriptions of Dadda II cover the period from the year* 629 *A.D. to* 641 *A.D.. But he must have certainly come to throne a little earlier and must have ruled till about* 650 *A.D.. This is based on the records of his successors.*

Harṣa and Dharasena III (c.621-27 A.D.), elder brother of Dhruvasena II.[38] It can also be argued that the conflict took place between Harṣa and Dharasena IV as Dadda II was also contemporary to him. Dadda II was contemporary to Dharasena III, Dhruvasena II, and Dharasena IV.

The original sources at our disposal do not help us in coming to a definite conclusion. Dr. Virji has argued this issue fairly well[39] and she says that it must have taken place during the reign of Dhruvasena II. She fixed the approximate date of this war about 632 A.D..

Anyhow, this expedition of Harṣa "resulted in complete defeat of Dhruvasena II" and "the latter", opines Smith, "was compelled to sue for peace, to accept the hand of the victor's daughter, and to be content with the position of a feudatory vassal."[40] Late Dr. Mookherji holds the similar views.[41] Dr. Sircar has also maintained that the Valabhī ruler was "a subordinate ally" of Harṣa.[42] But Dr. Majumdar does not accept it. He says that "it might be wondered how the ruler of the small Gurjara state was in a position to protect the king of Valabhī."[43] Bühler had suggested that Dhruvasena fled to Baroch and it was "from his place of refuge" he negotiated peace with Harṣa and "was restored to his throne as a feudatory. The peace was cemented as has happened in similar cases, by a marriage....With this supposition, the magnitude of Dadda's feat is somewhat reduced, but it loses the appearance of absurdity which it has at first sight."[44] This idea of a tiny little principality extending refuge to Valabhī king has also baffled Ettinghausen.[45] I may humbly

---

38. *Shri Vaidya inclines to hold this view, "if the invasion happened during the early years of Harṣa's reign." HMHI., I, P.* 22.

39. *Anc. Hist. of Saurāṣṭra, Pp.* 72-3.

40. *EHI.*, 4*th Ed., P.* 354; *Ettinghausen, Harṣa-Vardhana, Louvain,* 1906, *Pp.* 47-49. *Cited in EHI., P.* 354, *fn.* 1.

41. *Harṣa, P.* 30.

42. *Proceed. All-Ind. Orient. Confe. Vol. XII, P.* 525.

42. *CA., P.* 104.

44. *Ind. Ant., Vol. XVII, P.* 196.

45. *op. cit., P.* 40.

suggest that the Valabhī king after his defeat at Harṣa's hands had only one alternative to escape death and it was to get immediate and nearest shelter. It, therefore, could not be other than Dadda's court which was the nearest place for him.

Dr. Majumdar has contended that the Gurjaras, Lāṭa and Mālvā were hostile to Prabhākaravardhana and they "formed a group of buffer states between Harṣa and Pulakeśin II and could rely upon the protection of the latter against the aggressive designs of the former."[46]

We do not know what was the immediate cause of this conflict between Kanauj and Valabhī, but it appears that Mālvā might have been the bone of contention. This fertile province of Mālvā was conquered either by Prabhākaravardhana or by Rājyavardhana, but during the chaotic conditions following the murder of Rājyavardhana, Mālvā might have been rewrested by Valabhī rulers.[47] Harṣa, therefore, must have turned his attention to regain this lost province when he was free from his worries in the east. According to Dr. Altekar, also, "the cause of conflict between the two powers must have arisen on account of their clashing imperialistic ambitions in Gujrāt and Mālvā."

Harṣa's conquest over Valabhī was a brilliant achievement and it must have enhanced his position in the country. He cast his net further wide and "the matrimonial arrangement," to quote Dr. Tripathi, 'was undoubtedly a masterly stroke of diplomacy as it procured for Harṣa the alliance of his quondam foe, who could henceforth be relied upon to restrain the northern ambitions (*if any*) of his great southern neighbour Pulakeśin II."[48] Dr. Tripathi, however, does not agree to the view expressed by Smith and Mookherji that the Valabhī king was reduced to the status of a subordinate or vassal. The learned scholar has rightly argued that Dhruvabhaṭa soon regained his respectful place as an inde-

46. *CA.*, *Pp.* 104-5.

47. *That the Mālvā was under the possession of Śīlāditya and his successors is almost certain. Ind. Ant., Vol. LXII, Pp.* 121*ff; EHI., 4th Ed., P.* 344, *fn.* 2; *Beal, II, P.* 260; *Watters, II, P.* 242.

48. *THK.*, *P.* 111.

pendent ruler.[49] He bases his conclusion on the evidence supplied by Yuan Chwang.[50] But Dr. Majumdar, on the other hand, takes a different line altogether. He admits that "the inscriptions of Gurjaras of Baroch exultingly mention the fact that Dadda II obtained great glory by protecting (*or rescuing*) the lord of Valabhī who had been overpowered by the great lord, the illustrious Harshadeva." "But", he tells us that "this proves that a conflict took place" and "Harṣa at first gained some successes," but the Valabhī ruler "retrieved the situation with the help of Dadda II, and, perhaps other allies."[51] He sums up the result in the following words, "There is no basis at all for the view that Valabhī was conquered by Harṣa and that its ruler became his subordinte Vassal."[52]

Dr. Majumdar quotes (Dr. Tripathi) and tells us that he reached the conclusion that the Valabhī king "became Harṣa's subordinate vassal." In fact, this is a view of Dr. Smith[53] and is supported on identical lines by Dr. Mookherji[54] and others. On the contrary, Dr. Tripathi has opposed these views and he opines, as we have already stated above, that the "available evidence does not justify the current assumption that the Valabhī was a feudatory state of Kanauj."[55]

The above arguments, in light of the epigraphic evidences and the facts supplied by Yuan Chwang, deserve wide acceptance and I do not find any convincing and valid justification for Dr. Majumdar's conclusion that "there is no basis at all for the view that Valabhī was conquered by

---

49. *Ibid., Pp.* 111-112.

50. *Life., Pp.* 149-50, 185; *Watters, II, P.* 249; *Beal; II, P.* 270.

51. *CA., P.* 104. *He suggests that "a formidable confederacy was formed" and Pulakeśin II extended support to it. This "resulted in Harṣa's complete discomfiture." JBORS.,* 1923, *P.* 319. *These views are rightly dubbed as "utterly untenable." THK., P.* 111.

52. *CA., P.* 104.

53. *EHI., 4th Ed., P.* 354.

54. *Harṣa., P.* 30.

55. *THK., P.* 112.

Harṣa."[56] The facts and arguments, as stated above, make our conclusions quite tenable that Harṣa succeeded against the Valabhī ruler and that the latter concluded "peace with honour" and that he accepted Harṣa's daughter as wife and that the Valabhī kingdom enjoyed "a respectful place" in the comity of kingdoms.

HARṢA'S WAR WITH PULAKEŚIN

Harṣa's conquest over the Valabhī king was a brilliant success, but it appears that it proved an immediate cause of conflict between Harṣa and Pulakeśin. The Aihole inscription of Pulakeśin II records that "subdued by his (Pulakeśin's) splendour, the Lāṭas, the Mālvās and the Gurjaras became as it were teachers of how feudatories, subdued by force ought to behave."[57] This statement finds its echo in the description of Yuan Chwng. The latter records that "the benevolent sway of this king (Pulakeśin II) reached far and wide and his vassals served him with perfect loyalty."[58] To some extent this statement of the Aihole inscription is also confirmed by an inscription of Vijayarāja.[59] It informs us of the Chālukya feudatory line of Gujrāt. This grant of 643 A.D. was issued by Rājā Budhavarman, son of Jayasiṁha, and it has been suggested that Pulakeśin II might have appointed Buddhavarman or his father Jayasiṁha as his viceroy "after his successful campaign" of Gujrāt and Mālvā.[60] Significance is also attached to the find-spot of this grant, Kaira, identified with Kheṭaka, the place associated with Dharasena's grant.[61] That the Maitrakas were the feudatories at this time is further supported by the fact that they did not resume their old title of Mahārāja.[62]

56. *CA., P.* 104.
57. *Ep. Ind., Vol. VI, Pp.* 9-10.
58. *Watters., II., P.* 239.
59. *Acharya, Historical Ins. of Gujrāta, I, No.* 102; *Ind. Ant., Vol. VII., Pp.* 241*ff.*
60. *Dr. Virji. Ancient Hist. of Saurāshṭra, p.* 68.
61. *Ibid., P.* 68.
62. *Ibid., P.* 68.

This view may get further support from the fact that Harṣa's father Prabhākaravardhana was a source of constant worry to these states and that they appear to have suffered at his hands. When Prabhākaravardhana died they might have made attempts at regaining their independence and might have turned to Pulakeśin II for help if attacked by Prabhākaravardhana's successors. And it can be safely maintained that with the guarantee of protection from Pulakeśin II, they might have acknowledged his suzerainty and did not assume any royal title.

This must have been the cause of animosity between Harṣa and these states. The situation must have been further aggravated when Dadda II extended shelter to Dhruvasena II. It is also probable, as has been suggested by Dr. Majumdar, that these states of Lāṭas, Mālvās, and Gurjaras might have "made a common cause against a common enemy,"[63] or Harṣa, in order to ensure success against Pulakeśin II, might have thought of conquering these kingdoms which "formed a group of buffer states" between the two great rulers.[64] But Dr. Majumdar's opinion that "the hostility between Harṣa and Dadda II directly or indirectly precipitated the conflict between Harṣavardhana and Pulakeśin II,[65] does not sound well, as we learn from Yuan Chwang that it was Harṣa who made a premeditated war against Pulakeśin II.[66] He records that "the great king Śīlāditya at this time was invading east and west; and countries far and near were giving in allegiance to him but Mahārāṣṭra (Mo-ha-la-ch'a) refused to become subject to him"[67], and it was in consonance with the spirit of the people of this province. They, according to Yuan Chwang, 'were proud-spirited and war-like....and revengeful for wrongs...and sanguinary to death with any who treated them insultingly." Pulakeśin, while refusing to accept Harṣa's overlordship must have relied upon the "martial heroes who led the van of the

---

63. *CA.*, *P.* 105.
64. *Anc. Hist. of Saurāṣṭra.*, *P.* 75.
65. *CA.*, *P.* 105.
66. *Watters.*, *II*, *P.* 239.
67. *Ibid.*, *II*, *P.* 239.

army in battle" and who "went into conflict intoxicated, and their war-elephants were also made drunk before an engagement." We are told further that, "relying on the strength of his heroes and elephants the king treated neighbouring countries with contempt."[68]

To deal with such an adversary, Harṣa, too, appears to have made elaborate preparations. After having collected "troops from five Indies"[69] and "the best generals from all countries."[70] Harṣa (*Śīlāditya*), confident of "his skill and invariable success of his generals" and "filled with confidence himself, marched at the head of his troops to contend with this prince (*Pulakeśin*)."[71]

Thus it becomes clear, as Smith has opined, that Harṣa, "could not willingly endure the existence of so powerful a rival, essayed to overthrow him."[72] Yuan Chwang, who has given so many details about the preparations and other descriptions, does not talk of the results of the engagement between Harṣa and Pulakeśin.[73] But the description of the pilgrim gives us an impression that Harṣa was an aggressor and fought an offesive war. He, however, did not succeed fully in crushing the enemy. But the pilgrim does not give any hint of Harṣa's defeat in the engagement. Even Dr. Majumdar has accepted it.[74]

But that the Harṣa-Pulakesin war was "a memorable event" is reflected in the post-war records. It has also arrested enough attention of scholars. Several records[75] of the successors of Pulakeśin II claim

---

68. *Ibid., II, P.* 239.

69. *EHI.,* 4*th Ed., P.* 353, *fn.* 2.

70. *Ibid., P.* 353.

71. *Life, P.* 147.

72. *EHI.,* 4*th Ed., P.* 353.

73. *The pilgrim only records that "he has not yet conquered their troops."* *Beal. II.,* 256-7. *It implies that the battle was not decisive.*

74. *CA., P.* 105.

75. *Nirpan grant, Ind. Ant., Vol. IX., Pp.* 124-125; *Karnul grant, Ibid., Vol. XI, P.* 68.; *Togarcedu Grant, Ibid., Vol. VI., Pp.* 84-87; *Ibid., Vol. VIII, P.* 244. *A grant of Yuvarāja Śīlāditya Śryāśraya, Ibid., Vol. XIII, P.* 74;

that Pulakeśin II attained the title of "Parameśvara" or the "Supreme Lord" by defeating Harṣavardhana.[76]

It appears that Pulakeśin's successors had developed a sense of glory over the military achievements of the greatest hero of their dynasty and had looked at the Harṣa-Pulakeśin war with biased outlook and thus it resulted in utter exaggeration of a simple reference to it in the praśasti of Ravikīrti. And this has led several scholars to conclude that Harṣa was defeated by Pulakeśin II. Smith says, "His (*Harṣa's*) long career of victory was broken by one failure. Pulakeśin II,.... vied with Harṣa in the extent of his conquests."....Harṣa "essayed to overthrow him (*Pulakeśin II*), advancing in person to the attack... But the effort failed. The king of the Deccan guarded the passes on the Narmadā so effectively that Harsha was constrained to retire discomfited, and to accept that river as his frontier."[77]

Dr. Mookerjee has adopted a similar line and tells us that "Harṣa, who, after vanquishing Dhruvasena II, king of Valabhī, felt tempted to extend his conquests still further and try conclusions with Pulakeśin II....But little did Harṣa realize that on the other side of the Vindhyas there was a foe-man worthy of his steel who,...had become powerful enough to repeal his invasion."[78] Late Dr. Mookerji has ascribed this "military success of Pulakeśin".....''to the character of his people and administration."[79]

Gadval Plates of Vikramāditya I, Ep. Ind., Vol. X., Pp. 102-5; *Vakkaleri Plates of Kīrtivarman II., Ep. Ind., Vol. V, Pp.* 202*f.*; *Kauthem grant of Vikramāditya II., Ind. Ant., Vol. XVI; P.* 22; *Jejuri Plates of Vinayāditya, Ep. Ind., Vol. XIX., Pp.* 63*f.*; *Fleet, Dynasties of the Kanarese Districts, P.* 350.

76. "सकलोत्तरापथेश्वर श्रीहर्षवर्धनपराजयोपलब्ध परमेश्वरनामधेयस्सत्याश्रय श्रीपृथ्वीवल्लभ महाराजाधिराज परमेश्वरः।"

The reference is almost identical in all the records and it appears that all the successors, one after another, copied it in similar language.

77. *EHI., 4th Ed., P.* 353.

78. *Harṣa, Pp.* 33*f.*

79. *Ibid., P.* 35.

Dr. Tripathi regards it as "the first great military achievement of the south against a northern power" and this reverse (*of Harṣa*) was perhaps due not only to the proud spirit and war-like character of the Mahrattas, but also to Pulakeśin's superior and carefully equipped troops, cavalry and elephants."[80]

Dr. Majumdar, as usual, adopts an extremist opinion and says that "the great southern campaign, or campaigns, in the course of which Harṣa fought with Dhruvasena II of Valabhī, Dadda II of Baroch, and the Chālukya king Pulakeśin ended in failure."[81] Dr. Altekar[82], Shri Gauri Shanker Chatterjee[83] and Dr. Virji[84] and several others also hold similar views.

These conclusions confirm the view, as expressed above, that the repeated reference to Pulakeśin's success in war with Harṣa in the inscriptions of his successors is the result of their sense of pride they felt in glorifying their mighty and illustrious ancestor. Even Dr. Majumdar whose hostile views on Harṣa are well-known, has realized and accepted it, and he says that "there is no doubt that the result of the battle was magnified in favour of Pulakeśin by his successors, and also by those modern historians who hold that the Chālukya king inflicted a crushing defeat on Harṣa."[85]

But the only original basis of such result or conclusion is a reference in the Aihole inscription of Pulakeśin II composed by his admirer and co-patriot Ravikīrti, engraved on the temple of Jinendra, built by the composer himself. Kielhorn, who has edited the inscription in question, tells us that "the poem indubitably places him (*Ravikīrti*) in the very front rank of court-poets and writers of Praśastis.[86]" But, unfortuna-

80. *THK.*, *P.* 108.
81. *CA.*, *P.* 106.
82. *Gaurishanker Chatterji*, *Harṣavardhana*, *P.* 115.
83. *Ibid.*, *Pp.* 111*ff.*
84. *Ancient History of Saurāṣṭra*, *Pp.* 74*ff.*
85. *CA.*, *P.* 105.
86. *Ep. Ind.*, *Vol. VI.*, *P.* 3.

tely, the successors of Pulakeśin, and, to our surprise, several modern historians have accepted him, it appears, as a great historian and narrator of facts. We have to agree with Kielhorn that Ravikīrti was "thoroughly conversant with the rules of alaṁkāra śāstra"; and he appears "unsurpassed in Utprekṣās"; but can any one treat Ravikīrti seriously when he ranks himself with Kālidāsa and Bhāravi ? Does not the absurdity of such claims reflect on the authenticity of Ravikīrti who is accepted by many scholars as a historian ?

Kielhorn has laboured hard to bring to our notice "a number of parallel passages from the Raghuvaṁśa and the Kirātārjunīya" in this inscription. He rightly says that "for the principal part of his poem the description of the exploits of his patron in verses 17-32, Ravikīrti clearly has taken as his model the Raghudigvijaya in Raghuvaṁśa IV, and that very probably, he would himself have styled this part (*if not the whole*) of his praśasti, the Digvijaya of Pulakeśin Satyāśrya."[87]

The descriptions of Pulakeśin's exploits and various other achievements assigned or ascribed to him give us an impression that Kielhorn's remarks are fully justified and we cannot accept Ravikīrti as an impartial narrator of historical facts.

Secondly, this period is invariably marked with such trends in Saṅskrit literature. This trend is remarkably noticed in Bāṇa's Harṣacharita in his characteristic style, and I fail to understand as to why the majority of historians do not accept many things Bāṇa says about Harṣa's military achievements except those which are confirmed and corroborated by other evidences. These very scholars have taken for granted all details of Ravikīrti's praśasti as historical evidences.

I most humbly submit that it does not make much difference if some of Bāṇa's phrases are not found on the stone or metal while Ravikīrti's poem could have been engraved on such materials. It was composed for being engraved and thus it deserves to be treated

87. *Ibid.*, P. 4.

with same caution and reservation that had been adopted in the study of Bāṇa's Harṣacharita.

When one turns to the reference made to Harṣa in the Aihole inscription, he is bound to be struck with wonder as to why such great conclusions are drawn on the basis of it that Harṣa's defeat was conclusively decisive. The passage runs as follows : "....Harṣa, whose lotus-feet were arrayed with the rays of the jewels of the diadems of hosts of feudatories prosperous with unmeasured might, through him, had his mirth (harṣa) melted away by fear, having become loathsome with his rows of lordly elephants fallen in battle."[88]

We have seen above how the composer of the Aihole inscription should be treated. In the light of that background we cannot treat him seriously. But if we accept Ravikīrti, for a time being, as narrator of facts and as one who recorded what had actually happened, we still find it difficult to agree with the learned historians who conclude that Harṣa was defeated by Pulakeśin. The composer of the inscription only records that Harṣa's "mirth (*harṣa*) melted away by fear, having become loathsome with his rows of lordly elephants fallen in battle," and if we accept that every word of the composer is historically correct we can only accept that some of Harṣa's elephants might have fallen in the battle and Harṣa might have been worried over their fate who had been of great help to him in his conquests against several enemies. This may be due to superiority of the elephant corps of Pulakeśin. The latter possessed a very strong contingent of elephants. These elephants were "made drunk before an engagement." According to Yuan Chwang, the king very much relied "on the strength of heroes and elephants."[89] Ravikīrti does not tell us that Harṣa was defeated as clearly as he records other conquests of Pulakeśin. Had it been so the composer of the Aihole inscription would have referred to it in a highly magniloquent style that would have surpassed all other claims. The

88. अपरिमितविभूतिस्फीतसामन्तसेनामुकुटमणिमयूखाक्कान्तपादारविन्दः। युधि पतितगज (जे) न्द्रानीकबी (बी) भत्सभूतो भयविगलितहर्षो येन चाकारिहर्षः ॥ (२३)

89. *Watters, II, P.* 239.

conquest against Harṣa would have been the conquest of the highest importance as he was universally accepted as the paramount ruler of the North.

At the same time the historians have not paid due attention to the fact that none of the contemporary records refers to this so-called conquest of Pulakeśin against Harṣa. It was left for Pulakeśin's successors and present-day historians to record it. If Pulakeśin II had attained the title of "Parameśvara" by defeating Harṣa why does Ravikīrti not refer to it in an unambiguous language ?

All these arguments are enough to prove that Pulakeśin's successors suffered under an inferiority complex and they felt a sense of glorification and enjoyed the claim entitling their illustrious ancestor of a conquest over the paramount lord of the North. It was, in a sense, mainly based on their sense of self-glorification rather than on the bas is of records.

We can, however, understand their sense of glory over Pulakeśin's so-called success against Harṣa, but we fail to understand as to why some "modern historians' stick to such a baseless conclusion.

To sum up the arguments, in a cautious manner, we can say that Harṣa's attack against Pulakeśin was not a complete success and Pulakeśin continued to enjoy his sway over the south. It is probable, as recorded by Ravikīrti, that in this war Harṣa might have lost some of his elephants and that loss must have caused Harṣa's 'harṣa' (*mirth*) to melt.[90] He, after this loss, might not have purusued the war further.

Here I want to record a tradition current at Rāmanagarā, a village near Jabalpur.[91] According to this tradition Harṣa crossed Narmadā near Tilawārāghāta[92] and was engaged in a bitter fight against Pulakeśin. They fought for many days but no side could achieve

---

90. *Harṣa's interest in elephants is clear from Bāṇa's description of elephants in general and that of Darśpāta's in particular at Harṣa's camp.*

91. *I owe this information to Shri B. K. Mishra, an advocate of Jabalpur.*

92. *A place about* 5 *miles from Jabalpur.*

success against the other, and when both of them were tired of the war they agreed to an understanding, according to which Pulakeśin agreed to allow Harṣa to build a temple at this village in south of the Narmadā as a token of his conquest of the south. And, as a result, Harṣa built this temple in south of the Narmadā within Pulakeśin's territories.

This is an interesting information based on local traditions and it deserves some attention as Ravikīrti's poem also refers to the great river Revā (*Narmadā*) and the Vindhyas in the following words, "While he (*Pulakeśin II*) was ruling the earth with his broad armies the neighbourhood of the Vindhya, by no means destitute of the lustre of the many sandbanks of the Revā, shone even more brightly by his great personal splendour, having to be avoided by his elephants because, as it seemed, they, by their bulk, rivalled the mountains."[93]

With this reference to Pulakeśin's elephants in the vicinity of the Vindhyas and the Revā, Smith's conclusions, that Pulakeśin II "guarded the passes on the Narmadā so effectively that Harṣa was constrained to retire discomfited, and to accept that river as his frontier,"[94] . ppear well-founded. Dr. Mookerji also has suggested on the basis of this verse in the Aihole inscription that "the scene of the battle must have been somewhere about the Vindhya and the banks of the Revā (*Narmadā*) forming the northern limits of the empire of Pulakeśin, where his broad armies were encamped."[95]

Ravikīrti's reference makes it implicitly clear that the Vindhya was not in Pulakeśin's possession and so also the Revā. It appears

---

93. भुवमुरुभिरनीकैश्शा-
सतो यस्य रेवो (वा)-
विविधपुलिनशोभावन्ध्य विन्ध्योपकण्ठः (:) (।)
अधिकतरमराजत्स्वेन तेजोमहिम्ना
शिखरिभिरिभवर्ज्या (र्ज्यो) व (८) र्मणां स्पर्द्धयेव ॥ (२४)

Ep. Ind., Vol. VI, Pp. 6, 10.

94. *EHI., 4th Ed., P. 353.*

95. *Harṣa, P. 34; Dynasties of the Kanarese Districts, P. 350; Vaidya, HMHI., I, Pp. 12-13.*

that the southern bank of the Narmadā was the scene of encampment of Pulakeśin's armies. The local tradition gets further support from the fact hat Ravikīrti refers to the sand-banks of the Revā. In the whole mountainous track the Narmadā's bank is also sandy at Tilavārāghāta, and its adjoining areas, a place only a couple of miles away from the village Rāmanagarā where Harṣa is said to have built his temple as a mark of his conquest against Pulakeśin, the lord of the south.

Secondly, the long mountainous Vindhya ranges can easily be crossed at this place,[96] and Harṣa, most probably, decided to cross the Narmadā at this place. Dr. Majumdar's view that "the actual battle was fought much further to the north" cannot be accepted in the light of these facts and an information we get from Bāṇa.[97]

Bāṇa makes it quite clear that the whole of the Vindhya ranges were in the direct possession of Harṣa. We learn from the Harṣacharita that Harṣa reached the Vindhyas in search of his sister Rājyaśrī.

---

96. *Even today the road connecting the South and North passes at this point.*

97. *Dr. R. C. Majumdar does not agree with Smith and says, "There is nothing to support V. A. Smith's view"....He, relying on the Aihole inscription, and Tuan Chwang, tells us that "Lāṭas, Mālvās and Gurjaras were feudatoreis of Pulakeśin" and there were "independent kingdoms in Mālvā and Bundelkhaṇḍa" and therefore, "we can hardly regard the empire of Harṣa as extending up to the Narmadā on the south and it is not unlikely that the actual battle was fought much further to the north."* C.A., *Pp.* 105-6. *This view of the learned historian is against the very information we get from the Aihole inscription. If we accept that Lāṭas, Mālvās and Gurjaras were feudatories of Pulakeśin, we can only say that Harṣa's kingdom did not touch Narmadā only in the western sector of his empire; but we cannot say that it did not touch Narmadā anywhere else. Aihole inscription makes it quite clear that the Vindhyas and the Revā formed the broder of Harṣa's empire. Dr. Majumdar's opinion that many independent kingdoms existed in Bundelkhaṇḍa during Harṣa's times is also not well founded. Bāṇa tells us that whole of the Vindhya regions were governed by local chiefs who were fully subservient to Harṣa. HCCTH., Pp. 230ff.*

There he met Nirghāta, sister's son of Bhūkampa, the general of the Śarabhas. He tells Harṣa, "According to your command every day a search is carried on by deligent messengers."[98] This shows that Harṣa's commads were carried on quite faithfully and loyally in the Vindhya region and none can believe that the region was outside Harṣa's territorial jurisdiction.

HARṢA'S PENETRATION INTO FURTHER SOUTH

It is also probable that Harṣa might have concluded an honourable peace with Pulakeśin in order to push his march further south or he might have led this expedition into the south after the death of Pulakeśin II. A stone inscription found in the jungle near the village Gaddemane of Sagar Hobli informs us that "while Śīlāditya, the light of the quarters, the most powerful and a thorn in the way of the bravest, ascended the throne of his empire, Peṭṭaṇi Styāṅka, a brave soldier, capable of destroying enemies in the battle-field, pierced through the thick of the battle with the brave Beḍara Rāya, so as to cause frightfulness to Mahendra and reached the abode of Svarga."[99]

This inscription, according to the learned editor, "supplies clue to ascertain who the Śīlāditya and the Mahendra in it were." On the palaeographic grounds he is "inclined to indentify the Śīlāditya of the inscription with Harṣavardhana Śīlāditya and Mahendra with Mahendravarman I of the Pallavas, a contemporary of Pulakeśin II."[100] The learned editor also opines further that "it is not improbable that Harshavardhana's territories extended as far as Shimoga."[101]

Shri Nilakantha Sastri has also drawn our attention to a stanza[102]

98.. देवादेशादिदानीमन्वेषणं प्रति प्रतिदिनमनन्यकृत्यैः क्रियते यत्नः।

HCCTH., P. 233; *HCK.*, *8th Canto, P.* 71.

99. *Annual Report of the Mysore Archaeological Department, for the year* 1923, *Banglore*, 1924, *No.* 72, *Plate XIII.*

100. *Ibid.*

101. *Ibid.*

102. *JRAS.*, 1926, *P.* 487.

by Mayūra,[103] supposed to be Bāṇa's father-in-law, making reference "to southern conquest of Harṣa of the countries of Kuntala, Chola,. Madhyadeśa and Kāñchi."[104] Many scholars, however, treat this as mere "praise in the conventional and exaggerated style of a poet given to punning and without any reference to historical accuracy."[105] But the stanza read along with the information supplied by the Gaddemane inscription should not be taken so lightly as has been done by several historians.

Dr. Majumdar, however, indentifies Śilāditya and Mahendra of the Gaddemane inscription with Yuvarāja Śryāśraya Śilāditya, son of Pulakeśin II and Pallava king Mahendravarman II respectively.[106] About Mayūra's reference Dr. Majumdar tells us that it has "nothing to do with geography or history."[107]

We can summarise the views of scholars on Mayūra's stanza in following terms. Firstly, we cannot say definitely that the stanza ascribed to Mayūra is a genuine one composed by Mayūra. Literary traditions refer to Mayūra as Bāṇa's father-in-law and one of the court poets of Harṣa. Sometimes we find traditions that Bāṇa was the father-in-law of Mayūra. Dr. Keith says that such relationship does not appear to have been existed between them.[108] Dr. Chatterjee, on the other hand, opines that Mayūra's reference applies to Pulakeśin II rather more than it applies to Harṣa.[109] Saletor has attempted to identify Śilāditya of Gaddemane inscription with Śilāditya, the ruler of Valabhī.[110]

---

103. भूपालाः शशिभास्करान्वयभुवः के नाम नासादिताः
भर्त्तारं पुनरेकमेव हि भुवस्त्वां देव मन्यामहे।
येनांगं परिमृष्य कैतलमथाकृष्य व्युदस्यायतं
चोलं प्राप्य च मध्यदेशमधुना कांच्यां करः पातितः॥
104. *Conquests of Śilāditya in South. JRAS.*, 1926, *P.* 487.
105. *Ibid., CA., P.* 106*; Chatterjee, Harṣavardhana, Pp.* 118*ff.*
106. *IHQ., Vol. V, P.* 235*; CA., P.* 106*, fn.* 1.
107. *CA., P.* 106*, fn.* 1.
108. *Hist. of Sans. Literature, P.* 201*; Harṣavardhana, Pp.* 118*ff.*
109. *Harṣavardhana, P.* 120.
110. *B. A. Saletore, Harṣavardhana in the Karnataka, Journal of the Mythic Society, Vol. XX, Pp.* 169*ff.*

These views are not based on historical evidences. They are mere opinions. Mayūra was contemporary to Harṣa and it is not appropriate to dismiss his praise as conventional and exaggerated one. He must not have made such bold claims without foundations. But in order to adopt a cautious approach we must say that with the available sources at our disposal we cannot say anything definitely and conclusively, and it is better to wait for the ascertaind conclusion until some unimpeachable sources are made available to us.

OTHER CONQUESTS OF HARṢA

As stated above, we have no detailed information about Harṣa's conquests over several other regions and territories which were either under his direct control or were within the sphere of his political suzerainty or influence. Smith has observed that "in the latter years of his reign the sway of Harṣa over the whole of the basin of the Ganges (including Nepāl) from the Himālayas to the Narmadā, besides Mālvā, Gujrāt and Saurāshtra was undisputed."[111] We sha'l examine this statement of Smiṭh and shall try to see how far he is correct in referring to these provinces as part of Harṣa's empire.

NEPĀL

It appears that Bhagwanlal Indraji[112] and Bühler[113] are first to suggest that Nepāl was within the sphere of influence of Harṣavardhana. Sylvain Levi and Ettinghausen, on the other hand, opposed this suggestion.[114] Later Fleet and Smith again came forward to advocate the stand taken by Bhagwanlal Indraji and Bühler, and it has, therefore, become necessary for us to discuss this problem at some length in order to ascertain its validity.

Writing about Nepāl, Yuan Chwang tells that the country was

111. *EHI., 4th Ed., P.* 354.
112. *Ind. Ant., Vol. XIII, Pp.* 420-21.
113. *Ibid., Vol. XIX, P.* 40.
114. *Harshavardhan, Pp.* 147, 184.

"above 4000 li in circuit" and was "situated in the snowy mountains." It presented "an uninterrupted succession of hill and valley." He, then, tells us that "the kings of Nepāl, were Kṣatriya Licchavis, and they were eminent scholars and believing Buddhists." But the pilgrim does not give any name of the monarch contemporary to Harṣa. He simply tells us that "a recent king whose name is given as Ang-shu-fa-ma or Aṁśuvamma (Aṁśuvarman)....had composed a treatise on "Etymology."[115] This makes it probable, as some scholars have also suggested, that the pilgrim did not visit Nepāl personally. His description of that country was based on what he heard about it.

The pilgrim also gives an impression that Aṁśuvarman was no more on the throne of Nepāl when the pilgrim refers to it. But the description brings to our notice certain similarities in his account of Nepāl and that of Bāṇa. The latter tells us that Harṣa "has taken tribute from an inaccessible land of snowy mountains."[116] This may be identified with Nepāl. We shall now examine this question further.

The Vaṁśāvalī records that before Aṁśuvarman came to throne, Vikramāditya reached Nepāl and founded his era in that country. We cannot say definitely whether this reference to Vikramāditya is meant for Harṣa alone or not; but we know it for certain that during Harṣa's times or immediately before him there was not any ruler who assumed this title. If there may be any ruler with the title of Vikramāditya and who could come to Nepāl to establish his era he must have been Harṣa. This is proved on the basis of a number of inscriptions[117] of the time of Aṁśuvarman. He is known as "Sāmanta" or "Mahāsāmanta" in these inscriptions and it makes it certain that he must have acknowledged the suzerainty of Harṣa and consequently adopetd his era as a token of the same.

An inscription of saṁvat 153 informs that Vatsadevī, mother

---

115. *Watters, II, Pp.* 83-84.; *Beal, II, P.* 81.

116. *HCCTH., P.* 76.

117. *Ind. Ant., Vol. IX., Pp.* 168*ff.*, *Nos.* 6 *to* 8; *Kielhorn's Nos.* 531-33.

of Jayadeva, was the daughter of Bhogavarman, a Maukharī prince, and the grand-daughter of Ādityasena, the illustrious lord of Magadha,"[118] and it has been emphatically argued that "the great-grand father and great-grandson used the same era."[119] It has also been maintained that there were some Bais Rājpūts in Nepāl and they might have belonged to Harṣa's family to whom he might have granted land at the time of his conquest.[120] But the conquest of Nepāl has been doubted by Ettinghausen and Sylvain Levi.[121] Dr. Tripathi has argued all these points at great length[122] and he concludes that "we have no certain evidence pointing to Harṣa's interference in the affairs of the valley" and it is "safer to exclude Nepāl from the sphere of the suzerainty of Kanauj."[123] Dr. Majumdar has also followed a similar course,[124] but he opines that "it is likely that he (*Harṣa*) conquered some territories at the foot of the Himālayas."[125] While it is wise to be cautious, it is unfair to be hesitant, when evidence demands a conclusion. We can, therefore, say that Harṣa's empire included Nepāl as one of its vassal states as a consequence of his military campaigns into the Himālayan regions.

ORISSA

We have already discussed Harṣa's advance in the East while discussing his expedition against Śaśāṅka. Odra (*wu-tu*) or Orissa and Kongodha (*Kung-yu* (*gu or ya*) *-to*) or Ganjam divisions are also said to have been "attacked and subjugated by the king of Kanauj."[126]

---

118. *Ind. Ant., IX, Pp.* 178*ff.*

119. *Ibid., Vol. XIII, P.* 421.

120. *Ibid; Cunningham, Anc. Geog. of Ind., Pp.* 432-33; *Ep. Ind., Vol. I, P.* 68, *fn.* 4.

121. *EHI., 4th Ed., P.* 354.

122. *THK., Pp.* 92-99.

123. *Ibid., P.* 99.

124. *CA., P.* 113.

125. *Ibid., P.* 113.

126. *Life, Pp.* 159, 172.

That the kingdom of Kaliṅga was finally annexed by Harṣa is further proved by the use of Harṣa era in that region as we learn from the Ganjam inscription dated in the Harṣa era. It appears that with the death of Śaśāṅka, Harṣa, was the undisputed master of the entire eastern India. Dr. R. C. Majumdar concludes that both Utkala and Kongoda were conquered by Harṣa.[127] Dr Tripathi has maintained that "Harṣa made this region a strong military outpost of his far-flung empire, probably with a view to preventing any foreign incursions on the borders, threatened as they were by the eastward advance of Pulakeśin II."[128] These views of the learned scholars deserve to be endorsed fully in view of the facts stated above.

KASHMĪR

The pilgrim does not refer to the ruling king of Kashmīr who "hospitably entertained our pilgrim" and who "invited him." to read and expound the scriptures." He also "gave him twenty clerks to copy out manuscripts, and five men to act as attendants."[129] It is really surprising to note that the pilgrim does not tell us who was the king of Kashmīr who helped him so much and under whose patronage he lived for nearly two years.

At the very outset we must admit that nothing definite can be said about Kashmīr conclusively. Some scholars have maintained that Harṣa extended his suzerainty over Kashmīr.[130] Their opinions are mainly based on the testimony of 'Life.' It records that when Śilāditya heard of a tooth of the Buddha in Kashmīr, he reached the frontier of that country in person and "asked permission to worship it."[131] This information is further supplemented by Yuan Chwang's accounts. The latter records that "the tooth, brought from India, was preserved

---

127. *CA.*, *P.* 95.
128. *THK.*, *P.* 106.
129. *Watters.*, *I*, *P.* 259.
130. *R. K. Mookerjee*, *Harṣa*, *P.* 40; *Vaidya*, *HMHI.*, *Vol. I*, *P.* 17.
131. *Life*, *P.* 183.

in the tope" in Kashmir. According to the legends, the tooth was acquisitioned by a persecuted monk of Kashmir "who had gone to India on a pilgrimage."[132] The concluding part of the information of the 'Life' quoted above that Harṣa "asked permission to see and worship" the sacred relic is significant. It indicates that the Kashmīr valley was fully independent till that visit of Harṣa. It may be chiefly because of its inaccessibility. The pilgrim tells us that "the country (Kashmīr) had always been impregnable."[133]

The course of events that followed this visit of Harṣa indicates that he not only got the tooth, but it resulted in extending his hegemony in Kashmīr. We are told that "the congregation was unwilling to accede to this request, and concealed the tooth, but the king of Kashmīr, fearing the exalted character of Harṣa, had the tooth unearthed and presented to him."[134] When Harṣa (*Śīlāditya*) saw the relic, it is said, he "was overpowered with reverence and excercising force, carried it off to pay it religious offerings."[135]

On the basis of this story of 'Life' Dr. Mookerji opines that "Kashmīr in a way acknowledged the suzerainty of Harṣa."[136] If the story, as narrated in 'Life', is correct Dr. Mookerji's opinion appears as well-founded. Dr. Tripathi, however, does not agree to "the interpretation put on it" by Dr. Mookerji and says that "the expression that Śīlāditya carried off the tooth by 'excercising force' probably means nothing more than that he brought it to Kanauj much against the wish of the people of Kashmīr, who were even unwilling to allow Harṣa to see and worship the relic."[137] This shows that Dr. Tripathi has relied upon the story of 'Life' that narrates how Harṣa carried off the relic by the "excercise of force"; but he does

132. *Watters.*, *I*, *P.* 279.
133. *Ibid.*, *I.*, *P.* 261.
134. *Life*, *P.* 183.
135. *Ibid.*, *P.* 183.
136. *Harṣa.*, *P.* 40.
137. *THK.*, *P.* 85.

not support Dr. Mookerji's opinion that "Kashmir in a way acknowledged the suzerainty of Harṣa."

I submit that Dr. Tripathi did not realize the force of religious sentiments of Kashmiris they attached to the relic. Their deep-rooted sentiments are clearly proved by their outright refusal to allow Harṣa "to see and worship" the relic. They not only refused its darśan, but also "concealed the tooth in order to avoid its being carried away by Harsa forcibly. Thus it becomes quite clear that they were not prepared to part with the relic. But they were also afraid of Harṣa's superior force and were not prepared to offer any resistence. Thus it cannot be accepted, as Dr. Tripathi has suggested to us to accept, that Harsa brought the relic to Kanauj "much against the wish of the people of Kashmir." But we have seen that the people "were even unwilling to allow Harsa to see and worship the relic" and it is unthinkable that they allowed Harsa to take the relic away to Kanauj "much against the wish of the people."

It can be argued that the people can surrender to any superior military power and history offers many such examples, but they cannot do so when their religious sentiments are at stake and there is hardly any example of such surrender. They value the religion more than their independence or anything else and the whole human history is full of such examples. We have seen how sharply Kashmiris reacted to the theft of the sacred hair of the Prophet. We have seen their attachment to the relic of the Prophet in the second half of the twentieth century A.D., when man has become highly enlightened as a result of the tremendous advancement in the domain of science and technology. But that Harṣa's period was certainly dominated by intense religious outlook is proved by serious tension at the time of great religious assmebly where participants exihibited a sharp difference of opinions between the Mahāyānists and Hīnayānists.

Thus we cannot expect that the people of Kashmir in those days could allow Harṣa to carry away the relic and they watched this process as peaceful spectators. On the other hand, they must have raised a voice of strong protest against the action of Harṣa and the latter must have made

use of force against the popular opposition. Thus the version of 'Life' that Harṣa took away the relic by "excercising force" is meaningful. The king, "fearing the exalted character of Harṣa," might have pacified the people, and, probably, in order to avoid bloodshed and massacre, "unearthed and presented" the relic to Harṣa.

Thus the king of Kashmīr by presenting the desired relic to Harṣa escaped military defeat and the Kanauj ruler not only returned to his capital with the relic but also succeeded in extending his political supremacy over Kashmīr. And, therefore, we can say that Kashmīrīs not only "in a way acknowledged the suzerainty of Harsa," but the latter must have also been accepted as the overlord and suzerain in unambiguous terms. Harṣa, on his part, also appears to have made a reciprocal gesture of goodwill and honourable peace and must have allowed Kashmīr to its full political autonomy and to a place of respectful existence.

Dr. Ray has drawn our attention to king Harsa as being referred to in the Rājataraṅgiṇī, and he tries to identify him with king Harṣa of Kanauj.[138] This is based on a passage in the Rājataraṅgiṇī.[139] It records that "from that period onwards this country, which had suffered from internal dissensions, was, for sometime, subject to Harṣa and other kings."[140] The suggestion made by Dr. Ray is feasible and it cannot be dismissed as altogether baseless. Dr. Tripathi, however, has offered to reject this identification.[141] Stein has also rejected it on the grounds of "chronological aberration."[142] Dr. Tripathi reminds us that "this Harṣa had

---

138. *IHQ.*, 1927, *Pp.* 780*f.*
139. *Stein, Rājataraṅgiṇī, P.* 56, *fn.* 7.
140. "इदं स्वभेदविधुरं हर्षादीना धराभुजां
क्वचित् कामभूद् भोज्य ततः प्रभृति मण्डलम्"
Vol. I., Book II, Verse 7.
141. *THK.*, *P.* 86.
142. *Stein, Rājataraṅgiṇī, P.* 56, *fn.* 7., *cited in THK.*, *P.* 86.

a son....whereas the Harṣa of Kanauj left no successor."[143] At present we cannot say anything conclusively on this proposed identification and it is better to await further researches. But Harṣa's march to Kashmīr and his success in that country is amply proved on the authority of 'Life'.

KĀMARŪPA

Yuan Chwang records a similar episode of Harṣa's life and it indicates that Harṣa also succeeded in expanding his sphere of influence in the Brahmaputrā valley. The pilgrim informs us that Harṣa "had been on an expedition to a country called 'Kung-yu-ta', and was on his way back to Kanauj to hold a great Buddhist assembly."[144] When he heard of the Chinese pilgrim "at the court of king Kumāra," Harṣa "sent a summon" to the king of Kâmarūpa "to repair to him with his foreign guest." Kumāra refused to oblige Harṣa and the former sent a message that "the king could have his head but not his guest."[145] Harṣa retorted that he would "trouble" for his "head." This reply changed Kumāra's attitude and he "became submissive and proceeded with the pilgrim and a grand retinue to join Śīlāditya."[146] This interesting story seems to have been a little exaggerated by the pilgrim. We know that Kumāra was already a great friend of Harṣa as revealed by former's friendly gesture during latter's march against Śaśāṅka. His presence at both the assemblies at Prayāga and Kānyakubja leaves no doubt about his allegiance to Harṣa.

With these and several other conquests Harṣa became the supreme ruler of the North. His long reign for nearly four decades is marked with many achievements in the domain of art and culture to which we propose to refer later.

---

143. *Ibid., P.* 86.
144. *Watters, I., P.* 349.
145. *Ibid.*
146. *Ibid.*

CHRONOLOGY OF HARṢA'S WARS AND CAMPAIGNS

Yuan Chwang records that Harṣa built "a great army and set out to avenge his brother's murder and to reduce the neighbouring countries to subjection." We have seen how he avenged his brother's murder but it is difficult to give a chronologically ascertained sequence to his campaigns which he undertook in order "to reduce the neighbouring countries to subjection." The pilgrim simply tells us that "proceeding eastwards he invaded the states which had refused allegiance,"[1] but he does not tell us the names of these state rulers who "refused allegiance" in Eastern India besides Śaśāṅka and the Orissa ruler. But it appears that besides these rulers and that of Kāmarūpa there were no other mightly kingdoms which could have resisted Harṣa's designs. Harṣa only fought those states which "refused allegiance" and spared the rest.

It indicates that Harṣa had no desire to bring all these kingdoms under his actual control. He was only interested in extending his supremacy over the country and allowed all other kings to rule freely who accepted his overlordship.

The pilgrim further tells us that Harṣa "waged incessant warfare until in six years he had fought the five Indias"[2], or "had brought the five Indias under allegiance."[3] If we take into consideration Harṣa's whole territorial expansion, Yuan Chwang appears to be correct. The pilgrim further tells us that "then having enlarged his territory he (Harṣa) increased his amy, bringing the elephant corps to 60,000 and the cavalry to 100,000 and reigned in peace for thirty years without raising a weapon."[4]

'Life' also records that Harṣa himself told Yuan Chwang that he "had been the lord of India for thirty years and more."[5] This led Dr. R. K.

1. *Watters., I*, 343.

2. *They are also known as Pañcha-Gauḍas. In Indian traditions they are Sārasvata, Kānyakubja, Gauḍa, Mithilā and Utkala. Havell, Aryan Rule in India*, P. 191, *Note* 1; *EHI.*, 4*th Ed.*, P. 353, *cited in THK.*, P. 119.

3. *Watters, I*, P. 343; *Beal, I*, 213.

4. *Watters, I*, P. 343; *Beal, I*, P. 213.

5. *Life*, P. 183. *This he told the pilgrim about* 642 *A.D.*.

Mookerji to "assume that all his conquests were over by about A.D. 612 and that he became king six years earlier in A.D. 606, the year 1 of the Harṣa era."[6] The learned scholar adds that "this assumption is also strengthened by the fact that the quinquennial assembly held in the spring of A.D. 644 was the sixth held in his reign....It is thus reasonable to conclude.....that Harṣa's war with Valabhī and Pulakeśin took place within A.D. 612."[7]

In order to get further support to his assumption the learned historian has also cited the opinion of Dr. Fleet. The latter holds this opinion on the basis of Hyderabad grant of 534 of the Śaka era.[8] He says that it is "implied by the title which Pulakeśin acquired by his victory over him (Harṣa), and that the victory had then already been achieved."[9]

Similar opinion is held by Vaidya. He tells us that Harṣa "founded his own era in 612 A.D. after he had completed his Digvijaya dating from his accession in 606 A.D."[10] To validate his conclusion the learned scholar observes that "Harṣa subjugated almost the whole of Northern India and established a strong and well-ordered empire which lasted till his death. He founded as a momento of his being a Chakravarti, a special era of his own...in imitation of previous emperors"....and "in response to tradition."[11]

Commenting on Dr. Mookerji's assumption, Dr. Tripathi has observed that it "seems gratuitous and open to several objections." Firstly, he does agree with Yuan Chwang's records that his six years began in 606. Secondly, "it would involve a discrepancy" as we know that "his inveterate enemy" Śaśāṅka was ruling over Orissa about 619 A.D.. And, thirdly, Pulakeśin begins his rule about 609-10 A.D. and "it would indeed

6. *Harṣa, P.* 36, *fn.* 1.

7. *Ibid., P.* 36.

8. *This grant was issued in the third reignal year after Pulakeśin's abhiṣeka.*

9. *Dynasties of the Kanarese Districts, Pp.* 351, 356.; *Mookerji, Harṣa, P.* 36, *fn.* 1.

10. *HMHI., I, Pp.* 11*ff.*

11. *Ibid., P.* 11.

be almost a miracle if at the very start of his career and with his position still unconsolidated at home, the Chālukya monarch inflicted a crushing defeat on Harṣa."[12]

The first objection is just based on his opinion he held in order to reach certain conclusions. But the second and third reasons are strong enough and we have to reply to them with satisfaction.

That Śaśāṅka continued to flourish as late as 619 A.D. on Orissa is based on epigraphic evidence and is now accepted by everybody. Dr. Majumdar has tried to answer these objections by dividing Harṣa's campaigns in to two phases. He tells us that Harṣa, according to Yuan Chwang, "fought his battles between A.D. 606 and 611-12 and reigned in peace between A.D. 611-12 and 641-42.[13] Explaining "the discrepancy" he tells us that the eastern campaign against Orissa and Kongoda.....would fall in the second period of his military activity after A.D. 641."[14]

The third reason as put forth by Dr. Tripathi is hardly convincing. Firstly, we cannot accept, as shown above, that "Chālukya monarch inflicted a crushing defeat on Harṣa," and secondly, it was not a war waged by Pulakeśin against Harṣa as an offensive war. In fact, the war was forced upon Pulakeśin by Harṣa, and it is more likely that Harṣa would have thought to conquer Pulakeśin "with his position still unconsolidated at home."

So far as Harṣa's campaigns are concerned, it is better to take them up in a phased order to ascertain their chronological sequence. Yuan Chwang appears correct, to a great extent, when he talks of Harṣa's wars and tells us that all the wars were fought before 612 A.D.. After the first phase was over he ruled in peace for nearly thirty years, and then after a period of nearly thirty years he again took up another round of wars.

We know that Harṣa participated in the march along with his

12. *THK.*, P. 125.
13. *CA.*, P. 108.
14. *Ibid.*, P. 108.

brother Rājyavardhana against the Hūṇas and then after his brother's murder he had to fight a number of enemies including Śaśāṅka, the Chālukyas and the Maitrakas. The scholars appear to have been divided sharply on the dates of his struggles with Pulakeśin II and that with the Maitraka ruler of Valabhī.

Coming back to Fleet's arguments, we find two important points which require satisfactory explanation. Firstly, he pleads that Pulakeśin II assumed the title of 'Parameśvara' "by defeating hostile kings, who had applied themselves or a hostile king who had applied himself to the contest of hundred battles."[15] Serveral inscriptions record that he assumed this title "by defeating the glorious Harṣavardhana, the war-like lord of all regions of the north."[16] Fleet has argued that the conquest that won for Pulakeśin II the title of Parameśvara was the one he achieved against Harṣa. This, according to the learned scholar, was achieved before the Hyderabad grant of Pulakeśin II was issued. This grant was made on the new moon day of Bhādra of Śaka year 534. This, according to some scholars, falls on the second August 612 A.D.[17], whereas other calculate it on the 23rd July, 613 A.D..[18] Fleet, on this basis, opines that Harṣa-Pulakeśin war might have taken place about 608-9 A.D.[19] Several scholars[20] have accepted this date which is said to have been corroborated by the accounts of the Chinese pilgrim.

On the other hand, some scholars have opposed this view. Dr. Tripathi has raised serious and forceful objections against this date.[21] He asks, "If this were a fact, would it not be inexplicable why Harsavardhana's name is not mentioned in the earlier Hyderabad grant, and finds specific

15. *Fleet, Dynasties of Kanarese Districts, Pp.* 351, 356.
16. *Ibid.*
17. *CA., P.* 237.
18. *Ibid., P.* 237.
19. *Fleet, Dynasties of Kanarese District, Pp.* 351, 356.
20. *Mookerji, Harṣa, P.* 38, *Fn.* 1; *Saletore, Life in the Gupta Age, P.* 74.
21. *THK., Pp.* 126*ff.*

mention with legitimate pride too—in the Aihole inscription of A.D. 634-35, and other later documents."[22] The learned scholar opines that "this omission goes against Dr. Fleet's theory, for it appears hard to believe that any of Pulakeśin's earlier inscriptions would ignore the name of so great and formidable an adversary, and particularly when the victory was achieved just at the start of the Chālukya monarch's career."[23] Explaining Pulakeśin II's title 'Parameśvara', he tells us that it "was very commonly assumed by kings in those days after gaining the paramount or imperial status,"[24] and Pulakeśin II, according to him, appears to have "assumed it as a regal title only after certain preliminary successes against his rivals and the consolidation of his power at Badami.[25]

Dr. Majumdar has also put forth similar arguments, and he, in a way, supports Dr. Tripathi fully.[26] In order to explain the statement of Yuan Chwang, Dr. Tripathi observes that "the text does not appear to be quite clear" and this he proves on the basis of discrepancies in the renderings by Beal[27] and Watters,[28] and the peaceful reign of thirty years cannot be reconciled with the later military activities of Harṣa.[29]

The Chinese encylopaedist, Ma-twan-lin records, "In the years 618 and 628 there were great troubles in the kingdom. The king Śilāditya made war and fought such battles as had never been before."[30] In light of these evidences, Dr. Majumdar's opinion appears somewhat reasonable that "considering the unsettled political conditions of the time it would be unreasonable to expect that Harṣa could reign in peace for

22. *Ibid.*, *P.* 126.
23. *Ibid.*, *P.* 126.
24. *Ibid.*, *P.* 126.
25. *Ibid.*, *P.* 126.
26. *CA.*, *P.* 237.
27. *Beal.*, *Vol. I*, *P.* 213.
28. *Watters*, *I*, *P.* 343.
29. *THK.*, *P.* 127.
30. *JRAS.*, *(N.S.) IV*, 1869-70, *P.* 86; *JASB.*, *VI*, *P.* 68; *THK.*, *P.* 128. *fn.* 2.

80 years without any struggle."[31] Thus we can hold that Yuan Chwang's statement on the chronology of Harṣa's campaigns cannot be accepted.

While discussing Harṣa-Pulakeśin struggle we have seen that it was, most probably, the result of the war between Harsa and the Valabhī ruler, and if we can fix a tentative date of this war it will be easy for us to fix the date of Harṣa-Pulakeśin war.

Dr. Bhagwanlal Indraji was, perhaps, the first scholar to hold that the war between Harsa and the Maitraka ruler of Valabhī must have taken place in the time of Dharasena IV.[32] The basis for such a conclusion is found in Harṣa's relationship with Dhruvasena II who is said to be former's son-in-law. We do not find this conclusion as very convincing. If Dhruvasena II was Harṣa's son-in-law, Dharasena IV, son and successor of Dhruvasena II, must have been Harṣa's grandson and the latter must have been dearer to Harsa than Dhruvasena II.[33] Prof. K. Chattopadhyaya has also taken a similar stand and he has done so with great emphasis on Yuan Chwang's silence about this conflict between the Valabhī ruler and Harṣa.[34] Another important argument to prove this conclusion is the absence of any reference to it in all the grants of Dadda II ranging from 629 to 641 A.D.. It is argued that Dharasena assumed imperial titles and Harṣa took it as a challenge and was, therefore, compelled to take military expedition against the Valabhī ruler.

At present nothing can be said on this point conclusively. These arguments of the learned scholars are quite forceful and no body can dismiss them as altogether baseless. But several scholars have held that the conflict might have taken place between Harṣa and Dhruvasena II.[35]

---

31. *CA., P.* 108-109.

32. *Bom. Gaz., Vol. I, P.* 116.

33. *It is also suggested that Dharasena "might have been born of a queen other than Harṣa's daughter." Dr. R. C. Majumdar does not agree to accept Dharasena as Harṣa's adversary, but he wishes to leave this identification "undecided." CA., P.* 110.

34. *Proceed. Ind. Hist, Cong., Vol. III, Pp.* 596-600.

35. *Vaidya, HMHI., Vol. I, Altekar, ABORI., Vol. XIII, P.* 304;

I have tried to explain that there is nothing improbable in Daḍḍa II's role as one who gave shelter to Dhruvasena II, and his silence about it in his own records might have been intentional as he was certainly an ordinary feudatory whereas the Maitrakas were a superior power. Even if the Maitrakas were feudatories of the Chālukyas, they certainly enjoyed better political status to that of the Gurjaras. Dadda II, therefore, did not refer to this action because of being a humble and modest feudatory. In fact it would have been looked upon as an absured claim, had it been mentioned by himself, and, therefore, it was left to Jayabhaṭṭa who recorded it with legitimate pride that his ancestor Dadda II extended protection to the Valabhī ruler when the latter was attacked by Harṣa.

Dr. Altekar's suggestion that "it is quite probable that the credit claimed for Dadda II may have really belonged to Pulakeśin whose feudatory he probably was, deserves our attention.[36] Yuan Chwang's silence can be answered on several grounds. We have seen that he was not a historian on a fact-finding mission and it is quite natural for him to miss many things of political nature as his mission was solely religious. His silence can also be deliberate and intentional because the Valabhī ruler "was a sincere believer in Buddhism,"[37] and it may be quite natural for the pilgrim to avoid a reference to his defeat.

Now as Dadda II ruled from c. 629 A.D. to c. 641 A.D., the conflict between Harṣa and Dhruvasena II must have taken place between these years, but certainly before the year 634-5 A.D., the date of Aihole Inscription. As the latter records Harṣa's struggle with Pulakeśin, the war between them must have also taken place earlier to this date.

We have already seen that the Harṣa-Pulakeśin war was, most probably, the result of the war between Harṣa and Valabhī ruler, and as the Lohner grant of Pulakeśin II of the year A.D. 630 does not make any

---

Ray, IHQ., Vol. IV. P. 464; *Sankalia. Archaeology of Gujrat, P.* 17. *Saletore also wishes to leave this identification "undecided." CA., P.* 110.

36. *ABORI., Vol. XIII, P.* 304.

37. *Watters., Vol. II, P.* 246.

mention of Harṣa-Pulakeśin struggle, it is quite reasonable to conclude that the war between them must have taken place between A.D. 629 and A.D. 634-5. We have seen that Dadda II's period starts from 629 A.D., and the war between Harṣa and the Valabhi king, therefore, can be fixed some time after 629 A D.. And as the war between Harṣa and Pulakeśin II was fought certainly before A.D. 634 we can fix A.D. 630 as a tentative date of the war between Harṣa and Dhruvasena II and the war between Harṣa and Pulakesśin II might have been fought in course of a couple of year, and we can also fix it tentatively in the year 632 A.D..

CHAPTER VI

EXTENT OF HARṢA'S EMPIRE

Like his conquests and military campaigns, the problem of determining Harṣa's empire and its expansion has also proved to be a knotty one. Several scholars have tried to give their own estimates; but recently some have tried to prove that those estimates were "extravagant" and were based on "insufficient basis." It has, therefore, become quite necessary to reassess the original evidences and form a dispassionate estimate of Harṣa's empire.

Smith gives us an impression that Harṣa ruled over a great empire during "the latter years of his reign." He ruled "over the whole of the basin of the Ganges (including Nepāl), from the Himālaya to the Narmadā.[1] According to him, Harṣa's hold over Mālvā, Gujrāt and Saurāṣṭra "was undisputed," and "even the king of distant Assam (Kāmarūpa) in the east obeyed the orders of his suzerain (Harṣa) whose son-in-law, the king of Valabhī in the extreme west attended in the imperial train."[2] Smith is further supported by Pannikar[3] and Ettinghausen.[4]

Dr. Mookerji has taken a more cautious stand and he says that Harṣa's "sphere of authority is, of course, less extensive than the sphere of influence or suzerainty."[5] He ends his survey of Harṣa's empire with a conclusion that it "was undoubtedly much larger than that of any other

---

1. *EHI.*, *4th Ed.*, *P.* 354.

2. *Ibid.*, *P.* 354.

3. *Shri Harṣa of Kanauj*, *P.* 22.

4. *Harṣa Vardhana, empereur et poete de L'Inde Septentrionale*, *A.D.* 606-648, *Louvain*, 1906.

5. *Harṣa.*, *P.* 37. *Dr. Mookerji was conscious of this difference in his treatment and he says that in records of the times, direct rule is sometimes confused with the power and authority indirectly exercised.*" *Ibid.*

individual state of the times in Northern India" and (it) "comprised practically the whole of the United Provinces (Uttar Pradesh), a larger part of Bihar and Bengal (with the exception of only Karnasuvarṇa), Orissa, and such parts of the Punjāb, Rājpūtānā, Central and Western India, for which Yuan Chwang does not mention other rulers."[6] The learned scholar, "with all the possible reservations," tells us that "Harṣa achieved the proud position of being the paramount sovereign of the whole of Northern India" and he tries to find support from references to Harṣa in South Indian inscriptions as "the lord of the whole Uttarāpatha."[7] He accepts this as Harṣa's estimate in the 'public opinion' of contemporary India.

According to Shri Vaidya, Harṣa's empire, "included probably the whole of Northern India exclusive of Sind, the Punjāb and Kashmīr," but he maintains that he (Harṣa) "established nominal suzerainty over these kingdoms."[8]

Dr. Tripathi has dealt with this "knotty problem" at great length and he concludes that "it is high time to give up all exaggerated notions of Harṣa's sovereignty or political jurisdiction extending up to Kashmīr and Sindh, Gujrāt and even the far South, Kāmarūpa and Nepāl."[9] The empire, according to the learned scholar, consisted of "portions of Eastern Punjāb, almost the whole of the present United Provinces (Uttar Pradesh) excepting Mathurā and Matipura, Bihar, Bengal and Orissa including Kongodha or the Ganjam region."[10]

Shri Chatterjee also holds similar views but adds that Harṣa had also his sway over Valabhī, Eastern Mālvā, Western Mālvā and Sindh.[11]

N. Ray opines that Harsa's political supremacy extended over

---

6. *Ibid.*, *P.* 43.

7. *Ibid. Dr. Tripathi has raised an objection to the title "Sakalottarāpathanātha."* *THK.*, *Pp.* 120-21.

8. *HMHI.*, *Vol. I*, *P.* 11.

9. *THK.*, *P.* 119.

10. *Ibid.*, *Pp.* 118-19.

11. *Harṣavardhana.*, *P.* 169.

almost whole of Northern India, up to Jalandhara in north-west and touched the Brahmaputrā valley in the east. In the south it extended from the kingdom of Valabhī to Ganzam District in Orissa.[12]

Dr. R. C. Majumdar has opposed these views vehemently[13] and he opens his discussion on the extent of Harṣa's empire with a remark that "the treatment of this subject is rendered difficult by the extravagant estimates formed by old scholars on weak and insufficient basis."[14] In order to put before us the so-called "strong" and "sufficient" basis the learned historian wants to explain that "when the study of Indian history was in its infancy, and people were not cirtical of the few contemporary data of ancient Indian history, then known, the scholars readily accepted the vague statements of Hiuen Tsang and Bāṇabhaṭṭa and pictured Harṣa as a great monarch and the last great empire-builder of Hindu India. These erroneous conceptions persisted down to comparatively recent times."[15] He himself claims to be "the first to challenge" the "accuracy" of "erroneous conception."

I submit that the learned scholar has failed to judge Harṣa and his political and military achievements dispassionately and impartially. It is, perhaps, because Harṣa was not friendly to Śaśāṅka, "the first great king of Bengal," who (Śaśāṅka), in the estimation of the learned historian, "conquered the whole of Magadha and probably even Banaras," and "extended his authority over the whole of southern Bihar and Orissa" and "even made a bold bid for the empire of Northern Inida."[16] In order to depict Śaśāṅka as great as Harṣa, if not greater to the latter, the learned historian has not tried to make secret of his aim and says that "if he (Śaśāṅka) had a friendly biographer like Bāṇa or Hiuen Tsang, (*Yuan Chwang*) he would probably have appeared to posterity almost as brilliant as Harṣavardhana. Butas it is, his fair name and fame have vanished and

12. *IHQ*., 1927, *Pp*. 769-793.
13. *JBORS*., 1923, *Pp*. 311*ff*; *CA*., *P*. 110.
14. *Ibid*., *P*. 110.
15. *Ibid*., *P*. 110.
16. *CA*., *Pp*. 78*ff*.

posterity knows him only as the cowardly murderer of Rājyavardhana and cruel persecutor of Buddhism."[17]

This long passage of Dr. Majumdar shows his love and sentiments for Śaśāṅka and the latter, according to him, could not occupy a great name in the Indian history because he failed to get praises from persons like Bāṇa and Yuan Chwang. On the other hand, the learned historian gives us an impression that Harṣa enjoys a respectful position in the long annals of Indian history only because he could extend patronage to Bāṇa and win the friendship of the Chinese pilgrim Yuan Chwang.

I respectfully submit that such remarks of the learned historian are not in consonance with the great place he occupies in the world of historians. There are always many 'ifs' and 'buts' and we must not allow ourselves to be led away by them. Archimedes, a great mathematician and physicist, is said to have opined that "if he could get a place to stand on and a fulcrum to work the lever, he might have moved the earth from its orbit." But that great Archimedes could not find "a place to stand" and "a fulcrum to work the lever" and, therefore, he failed to "move the earth from its orbit." If Śaśāṅka failed to acquire the services of a biographer of Bāṇa's eminence and did not succeed in winning Yuan Chwang's heart, Dr. Majumdar has tried to compensate that failure. I submit and hope that the learned scholars would agree with me that such an approach to historical studies is bound to give a shock to dispassionate and impartial researchers. It is not only unkind to Harsa alone but also to Bāṇa and Yuan Chwang.

We can admit that Bāṇa has exaggerated Harṣa's achievements, but they cannot be dismissed as altogether baseless. Yuan Chwang, too, should be accepted with great caution as his mission was primarily "to know only Buddha and Buddhism," and he "cared little for other things." But we have no reason to treat his accounts as "utterly untenable." The pilgrim refers to several kingdoms which he visited, and he, sometimes, also refers to the rulers. In his description of these kingdoms he appears to have treated the local feudatories and semi-independent kings as almost

---

17. *Ibid.*, P. 81.

independent rulers. Sometimes he does not refer to kings at all. He treats Harṣa as the ruler of Kānyakubja, but no one can accept that Harṣa ruled over Kānyakubja alone. Harṣa certainly governed a vast empire which consisted of many kingdoms, where kings were allowed to rule with certain amount of autonomy.

These conclusions and opinions present conflicting approaches and we have to see how far we can draw a somewhat definite picture of Harṣa's empire on the basis of original data.

Harṣa's ancestral territories included "portions of southern Punjāb" and "eastern Rājpūtānā."[18] Banskhera inscription makes it almost certain that the province of Ahichchhatrā was included in Harṣa's domain.[19] Madhubana inscription makes him the master of Śrāvastī bhukti.[20]

We have also seen that Harṣa is said to have been invading "east and west and countries far and near."[21] The pilgrim records that the people of Mahārāṣṭra (Mo-ha-la-ch' a) "refused to become subject to him."[22] He tells us that Harṣa's court was attended by several kings and feudatories at several times. His great quinquennial assembly (mahāmokṣa-pariṣad) at Prayāg was attended by the kings of "eighteen kingdoms," and the people of "five Indias had been summoned by an imperial decree."[23] Prominent among the participants were king Dhruvabhaṭa[24] (Tu-lu-p'o-po-t'a) of Valabhī,[25] and Kumārarājā of Assam.[26]

---

18. *THK., Pp.* 79-80; *HMHI., Vol. I., Pp.* 1*ff. Dr. Mookerji assigns him greater limits. Harṣa., P.* 11.

19. *Ep. Ind., Vol. IV, P.* 208; *Shri Kṛiṣṇadatt Bajpai, Ahichchhatrā, Lucknow,* 1956, *Pp.* 1*ff.*

20. *Ep. Ind., Vol. I, P.* 67.

21. *Watters., II, P.* 239.

22. *Ibid., P.* 239.

23. *Life., Pp.* 184-85.

24. *Identified with Dhruvasena II.*

25. *Surprisingly enough, he is referred to herein as the "king of south India." Ibid., P.* 185.

26. *Ibid., P.* 185.

That his imperial decrees were respected in many contemporary kingdoms and that the kings of these kingdoms responded to their suzerain's calls, is further proved by his "order" which he circulated "throughout the different kingdoms."[27] This order was for the great assembly at Kānyakubja. This assembly was also attended by king Bhāskaravarman of Kāmarūpa and the kings of eighteen countries and of the five Indias.[28] King of Jalandhar (She-lan-ta-lo) was given "control of matters relating to Buddhism" by "the king of Mid-India."[29] This "king of Mid-India" appears to have been rightly identified with Harṣa.[30]

When the pilgrim was leaving for China, Harṣa "commissioned four official guides" with Yuan Chwang.[31] They had with them "letters written by the emperor with ins tructions to present" them "in all the countries." This was done with an idea that "the princes of these countries might provide carriages or modes of conveyance to escort the Master even to borders of China."[32]

To understand the political conditions of Northern India during the period under review it is necessary to give a brief account of Kingdoms as referred to in the accounts of Yuan Chwang.[33]

LAMPA (LAN-P'O)[34]

It is suggested that it corresponds to old Sanskrit Lam-

27. *Ibid., P.* 176.
28. *Ibid., P.* 177; *Beal, I, P.* 218.
29. *Watters., I, P.* 296.
30. *Mookerji, Harṣa., P.* 44.
31. *Life., P.* 190.
32. *Ibid., Harṣa. Pp.* 44-45.
33. *THK., P.* 82; *P.* 111.
34. *Watters, I, Pp.* 181-2; *Beal, I, P.* 90. *Watters records that "it is important to remember that the countries which he described from "Lan-p'o" to Rajpur both inclusive were not regarded by the people of India as forming part of their territory. It was only by foreigners that these districts were included under the general name India." Ibid., Vol. I, P.* 180. *This is mischievous and malicious.*

pāka.[35] Cunningham opines that it may be identified with Ptolemy's Lambatia.[36] This district "has been identified with the modern Laghman (or Lughman)."[37] During the time of the pilgrim it was "a dependency of Kapis" or Kapiśā.[38]

NAGARA (NA-KIE (KA) LO-HO)

It corresponds to modern Nungnehar and was "included in the present district of Jelalabad."[39] According to Julien, it may correspond to Nagarahara. Like Lampa, here too, "there was no king and the state was province of Kapiśā.[40]

GĀNDHĀRA (KAN–T' O–LO)

The pilgrim tells us that "the royal family was extinct and the country," like Lampa and Nagar, was subject to Kapiśā."[41] He tells us further that "the towns and villages were desolate and the inhabitants were very few." This confirms our earlier conclusion that the Gāndhāra king was defeated by king Prabhākaravardhana and that the former was perhaps killed in the battle.[42]

India's borders not only included these territories but they also included the land much ahead of these countries.

35. *Ibid.*, P. 181.

36. *Anc. Geo. of India*, P. 42; *Mc Crindle*, *India from Ptolemy*, *Pp.* 104, 106.

37. *Watters*, *Vol. I*, P. 181.

38 *Ibid*, *I*, P. 181.

39. *Ibid.*, *I*, P. 185.

40. *Ibid.*, P. 183.

41. *Watters*, *I*, P. 199; *Beal*, *I*, P. 98.

42. *We have already referred to Bāṇa's testimony according to which Prabhākaravardhana is called "Gāndhāradhipagandhadvīpakūṭapākalo." Kūṭapākala is "one of the varieties of elephantine fevers and is the deadliest of all the fevers of elephants."* HCK., *Notes on 4th Canto*, Pp. 4-5. *This indicates quite clearly that the war against the Gāndhāra king, who is compared with 'Gandhadvipa,'*

Thus we have seen that Lampa (Lan-po), Nagar (Na-ka-lo-ho) and Gāndhāra (Kan-t'o-lo) were dependencies of Kapiśā. It is, therefore, necessary to understand the political conditions at Kapiśā in order to determine its political jurisdiction. The pilgrim tells us, "This country was above 4000 li in circuit with the snowy mountains on its north and having black ranges on its border sides;....The king who was of a kṣatriya caste, was an intelligent, courageous man, and his power extended over more than ten of the neighbouring lands."[43] We have seen that Bāṇa refers to Harṣa's success in exacting revenue from the lands of "inaccessible snowy mountains." It has been suggested that the land of "snowy mountains" may be identified with either Kashmīr or Nepāl. It is quite plausible to suggest that it may also cover the land of Kapiśā. The description that the king was a kṣatriya and that the people in the kingdom were followers of Buddhism, Jainism and Śaivism, shows that the kingdom was definitely within Indian boundaries and it is quite probable that the king of this country might have extended his allegiance to Harṣa and, therefore, the latter is said to have "exacted the revenue from the lands of snowy mountains."

UDYĀNA (WU-CHANG-NA)[44]

The country was "above 5030 li in circuit" The pilgirim does not refer to any ruling dynasty and it appears that it was directly governed by Harṣa. Mangkil (Meng-kie (ka)-li) was one of its "strong cities" and it "was chiefly used as the seat of Government."[45] It appears that it was an out-post under Harṣa's government to look after the administration of the frontier and border areas.

---

an elephant of best type, might have been fatal. And the king might have died in the encounter. With his death "the royal family was extinct" as recorded by Yuan Chwang.

43. *Watters, I, Pp.* 122-3.

44. *Cunningham says that it "comprised the present districts of Pangkora, Bijawar, Swat, and Runir. Ancient Geography of India, P.* 81; *JRAS.*, 1896, *P.* 655.

45. *Watters, I, P.* 227.

BOLOR (PO-LU-LO)

This country was also "situated in the great snowy mountain."[46] The pilgrim does not refer to any ruler of this country and it was probably directly administered by Harṣa or it might have been a dependency under one of his vassals.

TAKSHAŚILĀ (TA-CHA-SHI-LO[47])

Takshaśilā is one of the few great centres of learning of this country. Alberuni records that it was also known as Marikala.[48] Hugel identifies it with modern Rāvalpindī[49] whereas Cunningham says that the ancient site of Takshaśilā corresponds with Shahdheri[50] and the latter has been accepted as the correct identification.

The pilgrim tells us that "the chiefs were in a state of open feud, the royal family being extinguished, the country had formerly been subject to Kapiśā but now it was a dependency of Kashmīr."[51] This statement makes it quite certain that the country was not an autonomous unit. His reference to the dynasty "being extinguished" is important. It appears quite probable that Prabhākaravardhana might have come into clash with the king of Takshaśilā and the latter might have been killed in the battle and probably he left no issue. Prabhākaravardhana might not have got an opportunity to consolidate his gains, and, therefore, "the chiefs were in a state of open feud." But with Harṣa's conquest of Kashmīr the dependency must have automatically come under the zone of the Harṣa's influence.

---

46. *Watters, I, P.* 240.

47. *Both Fa-hien and Yuan Chwang "treat Takshaśilā as a district separate from Gāndhāra." But in Buddhist literature "it appears as a part of city" of Gāndhāra. Ibid., I, Pp.* 240-41.

48. *Alberuni, Vol. I, P.* 302.

49. *Travels in Kashmir And Punjab, P.* 230.

50. *Anc. Geog. of India, Pp.* 104, 144.

51. *Watters, Vol. I, P.* 240; *Beal, Vol. I, P.* 136.

SIÑHAPURA (SENG-HA-PU-LO)

Like Takshaśilā "there was no king" in this country and it "was a dependency of Kashmīr."[52] It might also have been within Harṣa's sphere of influence along with Kashmīr.

URASA (WU-LA-SHIH)

According to Cunningham, this country may correspond to Varsa Regio of Ptolemy and it may be identified with the modern district of Rash in Dhantāwar, to the west of Muzafaraba."[53] Another writer says that this country "corresponded pretty nearly to that of modern Hazara."[54] The pilgrim says that "there was no ruler and the country was a dependency of Kashmīr."[55]

It appears that these several "dependencies" of Kashmīr were actually governed by the ruler of the kingdom of Kashmīr. At some of these dependencies he found the rulers whereas at others he did not find any such ruler and from this description it appears that the pilgrim could not differentiate between the local rulers and governors or divisional administrators. These dependencies of Kashmīr must have fallen within the zone of influence of Harsa when the latter conquered the Kashmīr kingdom.

KASHMĪR (KIA-SHI-MI-LO)[56]

We have already referred to Kashmīr and have maintained that Harṣa's march to Kashmīr definitely marked his success in conquering it.

PUNACH OR PUNATS (PAN-NU-TS'O)

After vising the country of Kashmīr the pilgrim left for Punach or

52. *Watters, I, P.* 248; *Beal, I, P.* 143.
53. *Anc. Geog. of Ind., P.* 103.
54. *Ind. Ant., Vol. XX, P.* 336.
55. *Watters, Vol. I, P.* 256; *Beal, Vol. I, P.* 147.
56. *Watters, I, Pp.* 258*ff*.

Punats (Pan-nu-ts'o). The pilgrim tells us that "the country was a dependency of Kashmīr."[57]

RĀJAPURA (HO-LO-SHI-PU-LO)

We are told that like Punach this country "had no sovereign of its own and was subject to Kashmīr."[58] Thus it appears quite probable that these dependencies of Punach and Rājapura, like other dependencies of Kashmīr, might have been under Harṣa's overlordship.

TEKKA ? (CHEH-KA)

From Rājapura the pilgrim reached the Cheh-ka country. He does not refer to the king of this country and it appears that this province was directly governed by Harṣa.[59]

CHINABHUKTI OR CHINAPATI (CHI-NA-P'UH-TI)

The pilgrim tells us that the inhabitants had settled occupations and the national revenue was abundant." But it is surprising to note that the pilgrim does not talk of the king or ruler who collected this revenue. He, however, explains the circumstances leading to name this country as Chinabhukti. According to him, a Chinese vassal "being in fear. . .sent his son as the hostage to the court of Kanishka. The latter is said to have "treated the hostage with great kindness and consideration, allowing him a separate residence for each of three seasons." We are told that "this district was assigned as the winter residence to the hostage and hence it was called Chinabhukti."[60] Watters remarks that according to later authorities, "the whole story of the hostage is possibily an invention."[61]

---

57. *Ibid., IV,* 283.

58. *Ibid., I,* 284.

59. *Ibid., I, Pp.* 286*ff. Dr. Tripathi, however, opines that Cheh-ka was "outside the pale of Harṣa's jurisdiction. THK., Pp.* 86-7. *But Watters has made some baseless observations that this country "was not in India, but was one of the foreign states which lay between Lampa and India." Watters, I, P.* 291.

60. *Ibid., I, P.* 292.

61. *Ibid., I, P.* 293.

JĀLANDHARA (SHE-LAN-TA-LO)

The pilgrim tells us of "a former king of this country" who "had been a patron of non-Buddhistic systems. Afterwards the king met an arhat and learning Buddhism from him became a zeolous believer. Thereupon the king of "Mid-India" appreciating his sincere faith gave him sole control of matters relating to Buddhism in all India. In this capacity (as Protector of the faith) the king of Jālandhara rewarded and punished the monks without distinctions of persons and without private feeling. He also travelled through all India and erected topes or monasteries at all sacred places."[62]

We cannot say definitely anything about this king. The Life records that the king of "North India" was "Wu-ti" or Wu-ti-to" (Udito) who ruled with his capital at Jālandhara,[63] and who was entrusted by Harṣa "to escort the pilgrim in safety to the frontiers." Like the problem of identifying the king of Jālandhara we have similar difficulties in identifying the king of Mid-India. If the king of Jālandhara, who is said to be "a former king," was contemporary to Harsa during his early years, the king of "Mid-India" must be Harṣa alone. Dr. Tripathi does not decide anything but he feels that "the king of Mid-India may or may not be identified with Harsa, but it is certain that the latter did exercise some measure of influence over this kingdom."[64]

KULUTA OR KULU (KU-LU-TO)

After his visit to Jālandhara the pilgrim "travelled north-east across mountains and ravines" and reached the country of Kuluta (Ku-lu-to).[65] On the basis of "the distance and bearing of the district from Jālandhara," Cunningham opines that it may correspond "exactly with the position of Kullu, in the upper valley of the Byas river."[66] Yuan

62. *Ibid., I,* 296; *Beal, I, P.* 176.
63. *Life, Pp.* 189-190.
64. *THK., P.* 87.
65. *Watters, I, P.* 298.
66. *Anc. Geog. of Ind., P.* 163.

Chwang does not tell us of the government of this district and it is quite probable that the district was directly ruled by Harṣa.

ŚATADRU (SHE-TO-T'U-LU)

We cannot tell anything definitely about the identification of this country.[67] According to Cunningham, this country may correspond to modern Sirhind.[68] The pilgrim does not tell us anything about the ruler of this country and it must have come within the direct zone of Harṣa's government.

PĀRYĀTRA (P'O-LI-YE-TA-LO)

In the south-west of Śatadru at a distance of over 800 li was this country. "The king", according to our pilgrim, "who was of Vaiśya stock (Fei-she), was a man of courage and military skill."[69] It is quite probable that the family must have some connection with that of Harṣa, who is also said to have belonged to "Fei-she" stock and we have seen that "Fei-she" denotes the Bais Rājpūts and not the Vaiśyas. It is also not unlikely that the pilgrim might have referred to Harṣa who might have ruled this district directly. According to Cunningham, this kingdom corresponds to Pāryātra or Bairāt.[70]

MATHURĀ (MO(OR MEI) T'U-LO)

The pilgrim does not refer to the ruling monarch of Mathurā. He only tells us that "the king and his statesmen devote themselves to good works."[71] This may indicate that the kingdom of Mathurā was ruled by some vassal who was subservient to the Puspabhūtis. We have already referred to Puṣpabhūti, the founder of the line, who is said to be the conqueror of Śūrasena.

---

67. *Watters, I, P.* 300.
68. *Anc. Geog. Ind., P.* 166.
69. *Watters, I, P.* 300; *Beal, I, P.* 179.
70. *Anc. Geo. of India, P.* 337.
71. *Watters, I, P.* 302; *Beal., I, P.* 181.

STHĀṆVIŚVARA (SA-T' A-NI-SSU-FA-LO)[72]

We have already referred to the kingdom of Sthāneśvara. It was ruled by Harṣa. The pilgrim, however, does not refer to the Puṣpabhūtis.

SRUGHNA (SU-LU-K'IN-NA)[73]

Cunningham[74] identifies it with the modern village Sugh. The pilgrim is also silent about the ruler of this principality and it is almost certain that it was also under the direct control of Harṣa. This is further confirmed by the statement of the pilgrim who tells us that the capital of this country "was in a ruinous condition."[75] It is quite probable that the pilgrim refers to the capital city of the former ruler of the country which was in "ruinous condition" after the country was subjugated by the Puṣpabhūtis of Sthāneśvara.

MATIPURA (MA-TI-PU-LO)

Saint-Martin and Cunningham identify this country "with Madāwar or Mandāwar, a large town in western Rohilkhaṇḍa, near Bijnor."[76] The king of this country is said to have belonged to "the Śūdra stock." He "did not believe in Buddhism and worshipped the Devas."[77] We cannot say definitely how this Śūdra king was allowed to rule in the country where Śūdra rule was never tolerated for long. It is also quite probable that the pilgrim might not have been happy with this king who "did not believe in Buddhism," and, therefore, dubbed him as Śūdra. This kingdom must have been under Harsa.

BRAHMAPURA (P'O-LO-HIM-MO-PU-LO)

The problem of identification of Brahmapura is knotty one.

72. *Watters, I, Pp.* 314*ff*.
73. *Ibid., I, P.* 317.
74. *Anc. Geog. of Ind., P.* 396.
75. *Watters, I, P.* 318; *Beal, I, P.* 187.
76. *Anc. Geog. Ind., P.* 348.
77. *Watters, Vol. I., P.* 322.

According to Bṛihat-Saṁhitā, Brahmapura was the city in the north-eastern region;[78] but the pilgrim tells us that it was a country "more than 4000 li in circuit."[79] Cunningham opines that the country may correspond to "the districts of Garhwāl and Kumaon."[80] Yuan Chwang does not refer to any ruler of this country, and, it is almost certain that the country must have been under Harṣa's direct control.

SUVARṆAGOTRA COUNTRY

The pilgrim records that "to the north of this country (Brahmapura), and in the great Snowy Mountains, was the Suvarṇagotra country. The superior gold which it produced gave the country its name. This was the "Eastern Woman's country." Referring to this name of the country the pilgrim tells us that it was "so called because it was ruled by a succession of women. The husband of the queen was king, but he did not administer the government. The men attended only to the supression of revolts and the cultivation of the fields."[81] Watters remarks that this country may correspond to the 'Suvarṇabhū' in the north-east division of the Bṛihat-Saṁhitā.[82] According to Kern, this country, "in all likelihood" may correspond to "a mythical land."[83]

Several peculiar customs which the pilgrim ascribes to this country, make the latter's identification difficult. These peculiar customs are found even today in some parts of Assam. But the pilgrim tells us that "the country reached on the east to T'u-fan (Tibet), on the north to Khoten, and on the west to San-p'o-ha (Malasa),"[81] This description leads to conclude that the Suvarṇagotra country may correspond to mythical Sumera.

78. *Ind., Vol. XXII, P.* 172.
79. *Watters, I, P.* 329.
80. *Anc. Geog. of Ind., P.* 355.
81. *Watters, I, P.* 330; *Beal, I, P.* 199.
82. *Watters, I, P.* 330; *Beal, I, P.* 199.
83. *Ind. Ant., Vol. XXII, P.* 190.
84. *Watters, I, P.* 330.

GOVIŚANA (KU-P'I-SANG-NA)

Its location makes it a territory of Uttar Pradesh. Cunningham also tells us that the country "must have corresponded very nearly to the modern districts of Kāshīpur, Rāmpur, and Pīlībhīt,"[85] and he identifies its capital with the site of "the old fort near the village of Ufain which is just one mile to the east of modern Kāshīpur."[86] It is said to be "a natural stronghold."[87] The pilgrim does not refer to any ruling family and the country must have been directly governed by Harṣa.

AHICHHATRĀ (NGO(OR O)-HI-CH'I-TA-LO)

According to Cunningham, the district of Ahichhatrā "occupied the eastern part of Rohilkhaṇd."[88] The capital of this country is said to be "in a strong position." Smith records that Ahichhatrā was the capital of Northern Pañchāla and he identifies it with "the modern Rāmanagar in the Bareli (Bareilly) District" of Uttar Pradesh.[89] The pilgrim does not tell us of any king of this country; but we know it for certain that Ahichhatrā formed part of Harṣa's empire. It was known as a "Bhukti' in the Banskhera inscription of Harṣa.[90]

This confirms our stand that the kingdoms and countries where the pilgrim does not refer to the rulers or the ruling dynasties, were, generally speaking, either directly governed by Harsa or were within his sphere of influence.

VILAŚĀNA OR BHILASANA (P'I-LO-SHAN-NA)

Scholars have not finally identified this country. It has been variably restored as Vīraśāna or Vilaśāna or Bhilasana or Bhiladaṇa.[91]

85. *Anc. Geog. of Ind., P.* 357.
86. *Ibid., P.* 357.
87. *Watters, I, P.* 330; *Beal, I, P.* 199.
88. *Anc. Geog. of Ind., P.* 359.
89. *EHI., 4th Ed., Pp.* 391-92.
90. *Ep. Ind., Vol. IV, Pp.* 210-11.
91. *Watters, I, Pp.* 332-33.

So far as its capital is concerned Cunningham identifies it with "the great mound of ruins called Atranji-khera which is situated on the right or west bank of the Kālī Nadī, four miles to the south of Karsāna, and eight miles to the north of Eyta, on the Grand Trunk Road."[92] The pilgrim does not mention any ruler of this country and it is almost certain that the country "must have been under Harṣa."[93]

KAPITHA OR SĀṀKĀŚYA (KAH-PI-T'A)[94]

It is identified with modern Saṅkisā.[95] The pilgrim does not refer to the ruling monarch of this district; but its location makes it almost certain that the country was directly governed by Harṣa. Dr. Tripathi also opines that it was included in the Kanauj Kingdom.[96]

KĀNYAKUBJA (KA-NO-KU-SHE)

From the description of the pilgrim it appears that Kanauj was the most important city of northern India. This capital city of Harṣa's great empire "was very strongly defended and had lofty structures every where."[97] The pilgrim adds, "There were beautiful gardens and tanks of clear water, and in it rarities from strange lands were collected. The inhabitants were well off and there were families with great wealth."[98] The people are also praised by the pilgrim for their refined cultural taste and polished temperament. He tells us that "the people had a refine appearance and dressed in glossy silk attire; they were given to learning

---

92. *Anc. Geog. of Ind.*, *P.* 365.

93. *THK.*, *P.* 89.

94. *Kapitha is generally identified with Kapisthala of the Bṛihat-Saṁhitā. The latter locates it in Madhyadeśa. Ind. Ant.*, *Vol. XXII*, *P.* 180; *Alberuni*, *I*, *P.* 800.

95. *Anc. Geog. of Ind.*, *P.* 368.

96. *THK.*, *P.* 89.

97. *Watters*, *I*, *P.* 340.

98. *Ibid.*, ;, *P.* 340.

and the arts."[99] The pilgrim clearly refers to Harṣa as the sovereign of Kanauj.[100]

NAVADEVAKULA (NA-FO-T'I-P'O-KU-LO)[101]

This city was about 100 li from Kānyakubja and was on the way leading to Ayodhyā. It was either included in the district of Kanauj or in Ayodhyā. In any case it was included in Harṣa's empire as the district of Ayodhyā was also included in the empire.

AYODHYĀ (A-YU-T'E)

The pilgrim does not appear to be accurate in matters of direction and distance pertaining to Ayodhyā from Navadevakula. On this basis Cunningham "proposes a different site for Yuan Chwang's Ayodhyā.[102] But according to Watters, it is "better to adhere to Ayodhyā, and to regard Yuan Chwang's Ganges here as a mistake for a large affluent of the great river."[103] Alberuni tells that Ayodhyā was "about 150 miles south-east from Kanauj."[104] This ancient city of Ayodhyā is identified with Sāketa of the Bṛihat-Saṁhitā.[105]

The pilgrim does not refer to the ruler of this country. But this district must have been under Harṣa. Burn[106] has also drawn our attention to some coins attributable to "Pratāpaśila" and "Śilāditya," generally identified with Prabhākaravardhana and Harṣa respectively. It is not possible for us to say anything on this point conclusively; but several scholars treat these coins of Prabhākaravardhana and Harṣa as genuine

---

99. *Ibid., I, P.* 340.
100. *Ibid., I,* 343.
101. *Ibid., I, P.* 352.
102. *Anc. Geog. of Ind., P.* 385.
103. *Watters, I, P.* 354.
104. *Alberuni, I, P.* 200.
105. *Ind. Ant., Vol. XXII, Pp.* 174, 189.
106. *JRAS.*, 1906, *Pp.* 843-50.

doins, and, on that basis, Ayodhyā must have been included in Harṣa's empire.[107]

HAYAMUKHA OR ĀYAMUKHA (A-YE-MU-K'A)

This province was adjoining to that of Ayodhyā, and, according to Cunningham, it "may be represented by Dauṇdia-khera on northern bank of the Ganges."[108] Watters, however, does not agree to Cunningham's identifications of Ayodhyā and Āyamukha, and opines that "these identifications are mere conjectures and are of little use."[109] The pilgrim does not refer to the ruling monarch of this district of Hayamukh or Āyamukha and it is almost certain that it was under Harṣa's direct control.[110]

PRAYĀGA (PO-LO-YA-KA)

The pilgrim does not tell us anything about the ruling monarch and that makes it quite certain that the district was directly governed by Harsa. The latter "went in state from Kanauj to this place for his customary quinquennial great distribution of gifts, and alms, and offerings."[11] This shows that the place enjoyed enough importance as a great centre of religious merit in the empire for Harsa.

KOŚĀMBĪ (KIAO-SHANG-MI)

The identification of Kośāmbī has raised many problems. Cunningham identifies the city of Kośāmbī with modern Kośam, nearly 38 miles "south-west from Allhabad."[112] St. Martin, on the other hand, tells us that "it lay to the north-west of Prayāga.[113] Smith propounds a new theory and tells us that the town was "twice visited by Yuan Chwang is

107. *THK.*, *Pp.* 89-90.
108. *Anc. Geog. of Ind.*, *P.* 387.
109. *Watters*, *I*, *P.* 360.
110. *THK.*, *P.* 90.
111. *Watters.*, *I*. *P.* 364.
112. *Anc. Geog. of India*, *P.* 391.
113. *Cited in Watters*, *P.* 366.

to be looked for, and, when looked for, will be found, in one of the Native States of the Baghelakhaṇḍ Agency, in the valley of the Tons River, and not very far from the East Indian Railway, which connects Allahabad with Jabalpur." He concludes that "the Satna railway station marks the approximate position of Kauśāmbī."[114] Smith's identification is also full of errors. The recent excavations at Kośam have conclusively proved that Cunningham's identification was correct.

The pilgrim does not refer to any independent or semi-independent ruler of this district and it is certiain that the district was directly administered by Harṣa. Dr. Tripathi also opines that "its destinies were bound up with Prayāga."[115]

VIŚOKA (P'I(OR PING, OR P'I OR FI)-SHO-KA)

This district was between Kośāmbī and Śrāvastī. Cunningham tries to prove that "Pi-sho-ka" of our pilgrim is Sha-ki (Sha-ti) of Fa-hsien, "and he identifies it with Sāketa or Ayodhyā."[116] Though the identification appears well worked out, nothing definite can be said conclusively on this point.[117] The pilgrim does not refer to any ruler of this district and it must have been included in Harṣa's empire.

ŚRĀVASTĪ (SHIH-LO-FA-SI-T'I)

According to Cunningham, the town must correspond to "the great ruined city on the south bank of the Rāptī, called Sahet-Mahet."[118] Smith has raised several objections to this identification and he, "after careful study and personal excavations of the district, has come to the conclusion that the site of Śrāvastī is in the district of Khajūrā in Nepāl."[119]

---

114. *Ibid., P.* 366.
115. *THK., P.* 90.
116. *Anc. Geog. of India, P.* 401.
117. *Watters., I, Pp.* 373-76.
118. *Anc. Geog. of Ind., P.* 409.
119. *JRAS.,* 1898, *P.* 527; *Ibid.,* 1900, *Art.* 1.

There are many other conflicting views[120] which can hardly reconcile to each other. But the approach of Cunningham appears to have better foundations. The pilgrim does not tell us of any ruling monarch, but we know it for certain on the basis of an epigraphic evidence that the region was within Harṣa's domain.[121] It was a province (bhukti) of Harṣa's empire.

KAPILAVASTU (KIE-PI-LO-FA-SU-TU)[122]

The pilgrim tells us that "the 'royal city' was such a complete waste its area could not de ascertained."[123] He adds that "the district had been left desolate for a very long time" and "it was very sparsely inhabited." "The country," according to the pilgrim, "was without a sovereign, each city having its own chief."[124] This shows that the district must have been included in Harṣa's empire and the city chiefs must be local chiefs with some amount of autonomy.

RĀMA OR RĀMAGRĀMA (LAN-MO)

This was almost deserted as we know from the pilgrim. He tells us that the region "had been waste and wild for a long time, and its area was not defined; its towns were heaps of ruins and there was a very scanty population."[125] The Life and other Buddhist works make Rāmagrāma some 100 miles east from Kapilavastu.[126] The district must have been included in the empire of Harṣa.

KUŚINAGARA (KOU-SHIH-NA-KA-LO)

It is rightly identified with modern Kasia in Gorakhpur

120. *JASB., Vol. LXI (Extra Number); Ibid., Vol. LXVII, P.* 274; *ASI., Vol. I, P.* 330; *Ibid., Vol. XI, P.* 78.

121. *Ep. Ind., I, P.* 72, 74.

122. *For the identification of Kapilavastu, N.L. Dey, Geographical Dictionary of Anc. and Med. Ind., Pp.* 90-91.

123. *Watters, II, P.* 1.

124. *Ibid., II, P.* 1.

125. *Watters, II, P.* 20; *Beal, II, P.* 26.

126. *Watters, II, P.* 20.

District.[127] This was the place where Buddha attained Parinirvāṇa and the site, therefore, is very important in Buddhist literature. When the pilgrim visited the city its "walls were in ruins and the towns and villages were deserted...There were very few inhabitants the interior or the city being a wild waste."[128] The region must have been within Harṣa's territorial jurisdiction.

VĀRĀṆASI (PO-LO-NA-SE)

After visiting the deserted sites of Rāma or Rāmagrāma and Kuśinagara the pilgrim reached Vārāṇasī, one of the most ancient cities of our country. The pilgrim tells us that "the inhabitants were very numerous and had boundless wealth, their houses being full of rare valuables." The pilgrim does not refer to any ruler of the district and we have no doubt that it formed part of the Harṣa's empire.

GHĀZĪPUR ? (CHAN-CHU)

At a distance of nearly 300 li to the east of Vārāṇasī was this country which "had a dense and flourishing population."[129] This country is not properly identified. According to Cunningham, this country is identified with the modern Ghazipur in Uttar Pradesh.[130] No reference is made to the ruler of this country. It must have been directly ruled by Harṣa.

VAIŚĀLĪ (FEI-SHE-LI)[131]

The pilgrim does not tell us anything with regard to its government but it must have been directly governed by Harṣa.

---

127. *ASIR., Vol. XVIII, Pp.* 55*f.*

128. *Watters, II, Pp.* 25-26.

129. *Watters, II, P.* 59.

130. *Anc. Geog. of Ind., P.* 438; *Beal, II, P.* 61.

131. *Cunningham identifies Vaiśālī "with the site of the modern village of Besarh to the east of the river Gaṇḍaka." Anc. Geog. of Ind., P.* 443.

VṚIJĪ (FU-LI-CHIH)[132]

During the Buddhistic period the Vṛiji, generally known as Vajji in the Buddhist literature, was a confederacy of eight or nine republican clans of which the Vajjis were the most important people. Vaiśālī was the capital city of the Lichchhavis and was the headquarters of the confederacy of the Vajjis. The Chinese pilgrim refers to Vaiśāli and Vajji (Vṛiji) as two separate political and geographical units. Vajji of the Buddhist literature included the republic of Vaiśālī also but in Yuan Chwang's description Vaiśālī is not included in the district. This, according to Watters, "is peculiar, and it is apparently incorrect"[133] It is quite likely that during the period under review both these districts were separate geographical units and were also governed as separate administrative districts of Harṣa's empire. The pilgrim does not refer to the ruler of the district and it must have been directly governed by Harṣa.

NEPĀL (NI-P'O-LO)

The reference has already been made to the kingdom of Nepāl and we have seen that the valley was undoubtedly within Harṣa's sphere of influence.

MAGADHA (MO-KIE-TO)

We have already seen that the province of Magadha was included in the empire of Harsa. The latter's Nālandā seals make it certain that the region was within his territorial jurisdiction. Yuan Chwang refers to "a Bronze (t'u-shi) temple in course of construction by king Śilāditya.[134] The latter was no other than king Harṣa of Kanauj.

MONGHYR (I-LAN-NA-PO-I A-TO)

St. Martin and Cunningham identify this region with modern territories of Monghyr district.[135] This identification is generally accepted

132. *The Country was also called Saṁvajji (San-fa-chih). Watters, II, P.* 81.

133. *Watters, II, P.* 81.

134. *Ibid., II, P.* 171.

135. *Ancient Geography of India, P.* 476.

as correct.[136] Referring to its political status the pilgrim informs us, "In recent times the king of a neighbouring state had deposed the ruler and given the capital to the Buddhist Brethren, erecting in the city two monasteries each of which had about 1000 Brethren of the Sarvāstivādin school."[137] This description, most probably, refers to the march of Harṣa against Śaśāṅka. The Monghyr region must have been under the active control of Śaśāṅka before the latter was conquered by Harṣa who must have given the capital to the Buddhist Brethren. There was no other "king of a neighbouring state" capable of deposing the ruler of Monghyr and who made a gesture of generosity by donating the capital to the Buddhists. The remaining territories of the region must have been incorporated with the empire of Harṣa. Dr. Tripathi also holds similar views.[138]

CHAMPĀ (CHAN-P'O)

According to Cunningham, the city of Champā might correspond to "modern Bhagalpur"[139] and "this identification has been accepted" as correct.[140] The pilgrim does not refer to its political status but we must accept it as an integral part of Harsa's empire.

KAJANGALA[141] (KA-CHU-WEN (?)-KI-LO)

According to Cunningham, Kajangala may correspond to Kankjol, now known as Rajamahal,[142] whereas Fergusson opines that "the place must be sought for either at Sicligully or Rajamahal, or somewhere between these places."[143]

---

136. *Watters, II, P.* 179.
137. *Ibid., I, P.* 178.
138. *THK., P.* 101.
139. *Anc. Geog. of Ind., P.* 477.
140. *Watters, II, P.* 182; *Fergusson, JRAS., Vol. VI,* 1873. *c, P.* 235.
141. *This name is so restored on the basis of Buddhists Pāli texts. JRAS.,* 1904, *Pp.* 86-8.
142. *Anc. Geog. of India, P.* 478.
143. *JRAS., Vol. IV,* 1873, *P.* 238.

Referring to its political status the pilgrim tells us that "the native dynasty had been extinguished some centuries before the time of the pilgrim's visit, and the country had come under a neighbouring state, so the capital was deserted and the people lived in towns and villages. Hence when king Śīlāditya in his progress to "East India" held his court here, he cut grass to make huts, and burnt these when leaving." We have already discussed Harṣa's march to "Eastern India." It was during this march he must have stayed here. This region was definitely within Harṣa's empire. Dr. R. C. Majumdar also holds similar opinion.[144]

PUṆḌRAVARDHANA (PUN-NA-FA-TAN-NA)

Cunningham identifies it with "the modern district of Pubna (Pabna)"[145] whereas Fergusson opines that it may correspond to modern Rungpur (Rangpur).[146]

SAMATAṬA (SAN-MO-TA-TA)

According to Cunningham, this district corresponds to "the Delta of the Ganges and its chief city which occupied the site of the modern Jessore."[147] But Fergusson identifies it with the district of Dacca with its capital at Sonargaon.[148] Watters places i to the "south of Dacca," and in the district of the modern Farīdpur.

TĀMRALIPTI (TAN-MO-LIH-TI)

This is identified with modern Tumluk.[149] Fergusson does not agree to this identification and opines that Satgaon must be accepted as an ancient site of Tāmralipti.[150] But further researches have proved that Tumluk represents the real site of Tāmralipti.[151] Tāmralipti was an

144. *JBROS.*, 1929, *P.* 314.
145. *Anc. Geog. of India*, *P.* 480.
146. *JRAS.*, *Vol. IV*, 1873, *P.* 238.
147. *Anc. Geog. of Ind.*, *P.* 501.
148. *JRAS.*, *Vol. IV*, 1873, *P.* 242.
149. *Watters*, *II*, *P.* 190.
150. *JRAS.*, *Vol. IV*, 1873, *P.* 243.
151. *Buddhist Text society Vol. V*, *Part II*, *P.* 4.

important centre "where land and water communications met."[152] It was visited by Fa-hien and I-Tsing.

KARṆASUVARṆA (KIE (KA)-LO-NA-SU-LA-NA)

According to Cunningham, the country may correspond to the districts of Singhbūm and Bīrabhūm[153] whereas Fergusson opines that the kingdoms of Karṇasuvarṇa must include "the northern parts of Burdwan, the whole of Bīrabhūm, and the province of Murshidabad, including all those parts of the districts of Kishnaghur and Jessore which were then sufficiently raised above the waters of the Ganges to be habitable."[154]

These four districts of puṇḍravardhana, Samataṭa, Tāmralipti and Karṇasuvarṇa were included in the kingdom of Śaśāṅka, and we have seen that Harsa was successful in defeating Śaśāṅka. After his conquest against Śaśāṅka Harsa incorporated these territories in his empire and that is why the pilgrim does not refer to the ruling kings of these districts.

KĀMARŪPA (KA-MO-LO-P'O)

It corresponds to the western part of Assam.[155] We have already seen that the ruler of this kingdom accepted Harṣa as his overlord.

OḌRA (WU-T'U)

This country is identified with modern Orissa.[156] We have already seen that it was conquered and annexed by Harṣa.

KONGODHA (KUNG-YU) (GU OR YA)-T'O)

Both Cunningham[157] and Fergusson[158] identify this district with

---

152. *Watters, II, P.* 190.
153. *Anc. Geog. of Ind., P.* 505.
154. *JRAS., Vol. IV,* 1873, *P.* 248.
155. *Anc. Geog. of Ind., P.* 500; *JRAS., Vol. IV,* 1873, *P.* 238.
156. *Watters, II, Pp.* 193*f.*
157. *Anc. Geog. of Ind., P.* 513.
158. *JRAS., Vol. IV,* 1873, *P.* 250.

the region about Chilkā Lake. Watters opines that it "may perhaps be the Kūṇḍya of the Hemakūṇḍya (also called Hemakūṭya) in the south-eastern division of the Bṛihat-Saṁhitā's topography."[159] The pilgrim informs us that the people of this country were "valorous" and "as the towns were naturally strong there was a gallant army which kept the neighbouring countries in awe, and so there was no powerful enemy."[160] We have already seen that Harsa conquered and subjugated this country and that Harṣa "made this region a strong military out-post of his far-flung empire, probably with a view to prevent any foreign incursion on the borders, threatened as they were by the eastward advance of Pulakeśin. II."[161]

THE SOUTHERN KOŚALA

According to Cunningham, it corresponds to "the ancient province of Vidarbha,"[162] whereas Fergusson and Grant identify it with Chhattīsgarh region.[163] The ruling chief of this district was Sha-to-p'o-ha who is not satisfactorily identified.[164]

After visiting the Southern Kośala the pilgrim is said to have visited Āndhra (An-to-lo), Dhanakaṭaka (T'e-na-ka-che-ka) Malakūṭa (Mo-lo-ku-t'a), Koṇkaṇapur or Koṇkon (Kung-kin or (Kan-na-pu-lo) and Mahārāṣṭra (Mo-ha-la-ch'a). These territories were outside Harsa's empire. From Mahārāṣṭra the pilgrim again entered the zone of Harsa's sphere of influence.

BHṚIGUKACHCHA OR BHṚIKACHCHAPA OR BHAROCH (PO-LU-KA-CHE-P'O)

We have already seen that the kingdom of Bharoch was ruled by Dadda II and the latter was defeated by Harṣa.

---

159. *Watters, II, P.* 197*; Ind. Ant., Vol. XXII, Pp.* 171, 179.
160. *Watters, II, P.* 197.
161. *THK., P.* 106.
162. *Anc. Geog. of Ind., P.* 520.
163. *JRAS.*, 1875, *P.* 260.
164. *Watters, II, Pp.* 206-208.

WESTERN MĀLVĀ (MO-LA-P'O)

The Pilgrim refers to "the local records" which enabled him to learn that "a king, by name Śilāditya, who had reigned over the country 60 years before the pilgrim's arrival, a monarch of great administrative ability, and of rare kindness and compassion." He is said to have "built a Buddhist temple, extremely artistic in structure and ornament."[165] Scholars generally identify this king with Śilāditya Dharmāditya of Valabhī. His nephew was Dhruvabhaṭṭa who was ruling over Valabhī during the times of pilgrim's visit.[166] On this basis, Dr. Tripathi has inferred that "Śilāditya Dharmāditya was the original ruler of Valabhī, to which he annexed Western Mālvā (Mo-la-p'o); and that his nephew Dhruvabhaṭṭa II, a contemporary of Yuan Chwang, was also in possession of Mālvā with its three dependencies." [167] We can agree to Dr. Tripathi's first inference that Śilāditya Dharmāditya "annexed Western Mālvā"; but we do not find any positive support to infer that "his nephew Dhruvabhaṭṭa II was also in possession of Mālvā." We have already seen that Prabhākaravardhana is called "an axe to the creeper of Mālvā's glory"; and that he must have conquered it along with the Lāṭas, Gurjaras and others. But it appears that during the troublous period that followed the death of Prabhākaravardhana, Mālvā was reconquered and reannexed by the Valabhī ruler. We can, therefore, safely infer that Harsa must have re-imposed his authority over Mālvā after his conquest of Valabhī.

AṬLI (A-T' A-LI)

The country is not satisfactorily identified. It must have been within Harṣa's sphere of influence as it lay to the north-west of Mālvā and we have already seen that Harṣa was the paramount ruler of the Northern India.

KACHCHHA OR KHEDA ? (K'I-T'A (OR CH'A)

According to Cunningham, 'K' i-t'a' may correspond to Kheda,

165. *Watters, II, P.* 242.
166. *Ibid., II, P.* 246.
167. *THK., P.* 109.

"the true Sanskrit form of Kaira, a large town of Gujrāt, situated between Ahmadabad and Cambay."[168] Fergusson locates 'K'-t'a' "about Cambay."[169] Watters does not agree to any of these two identifications and he suggests that it may, as suggested by Julien and St. Martin, correspond to Kachha or Cutch (Kachchha).[170] This view is further supported by the Bṛihat-Saṁhitā.[171] The pilgrim informs us that "it was a rich district subject to Mālvā to which it bore a resemblance,"[172] and thus it must fall within the sphere of influence of Harṣa.

VALABHĪ (FA-LA-P'I)

We have already referred to Harsa's conquest of Valabhī. This conquest resulted in friendship and it was further cemented by a matrimonial alliance between the two families.

ĀNANDAPURA (A-NAN-T'O-PU-LO)

Cunningham identifies this district with "the triangular tract lying between the mouth of the Banās river on the west and the Sābaramatī river on the east."[173] The pilgrim tells us that "it was a dependency of Mālvā,"[174] and, as such, it must have been within Harṣa's sphere of influence.

SŪRAT (SU-LA-CH'A)

This "was subject to Mālvā,"[175] and we can safely conclude that like other dependencies of Mālvā, it was also within Harṣa's zone of influence.

---

168. *Anc. Geog. of Ind., P.* 492.
169. *JRAS.*, 1873, *P.* 272.
170. *Watters, II, P.* 245.
171. *Ibid., II, P.* 245.
172. *Ibid., II, P.* 245.
173. *Anc. Geog. of India, P.* 494.
174. *Watters, II, P.* 247.
175. *Ibid., II, P.* 248.

GURJARA KINGDOM (KU-CHE-LO)

The pilgrim refers to "the king, who was a Kṣatriya by birth, was a young man celebrated for his wisdom and valour, and he was a profound believer in Buddhism, and a patron of exceptional abilities."[176] This Gurjara kingdom was in north of Valabhī and its capital Bhilamala (P'i-lo-mo-lo) was "exactly 300 miles to the north of the ruins of Valabhī."[177]

UJJAIN (WU-SHE-YEN-NA)

The pilgrim tells us that "the king was of the Brāhmaṇa caste; he was well learned in heterodox lore, but was not a Buddhist."[178] He must have been Harṣa's feudatory.

JAJHOTI (CHIH-CHI-T'O)

Watters opines that "Chih-chi-t'o' may correspond to Chitore; but, according to Cunningham, it may be identified with Jajhoti kingdom with its capital at Khajurāha or Kajūra or Kharjūravāhaka, corresponding to "the district of Bundelakhaṇḍa."[179] "The king," says the pilgrim, "who was a Brāhmaṇa, was a firm believer in Buddhism, and encouraged men of merit, and learned scholars of other lands collected here in numbers."[180]

MAHEŚVARAPURA (MO-HI-SSU-FA-LO-PU-LO)

We are told that "the king was a Brāhmaṇa, and was not a believer in Buddhism."[181] According to Cunningham, the city is said to have been identified with Mandla, "the original capital of the country on the

---

176. *Ibid., II, P.* 249.
177. *Anc. Geog. of Ind., P.* 312.
178. *Watters, II, P.* 250.
179. *Anc. Geog. of Ind., P.* 481; *Watters, II, P.* 251.
180. *Ibid., II, P.* 251.
181. *Ibid., II, P.* 251.

upper Narbadā."[182] It is difficult to agree to Cunningham's theory. The recent excavations at Maheśvara have proved conclusively that the Maheśvarapura of the pligrim and the modern Maheśvara, identified with the ancient Māhiṣmatī, are one and the same place. Its reference with Ujjain and Jajhoti also make it topographically certain that our view is more plausible than the one put forward by Cunningham.

These kingdoms of Gurjaras, Ujjain, Jajhoti and Maheśvarapura were ruled by local kings but they must have acknowledged the suzerainty of Harsa as their overlord.

SINDH (SIN-TU)

The pilgrim tells us that "the king, who was of the Śūdra caste, was a sincere man and a believer in Buddhism."[183] We have already seen that Prabhākaravardhana was the first ruler of the Puṣpabhūti dynasty who was "a fever to the king of Sindha." Harsa is also said to have "pounded the ruler of Sindha and appropriated the fortune of that king." Dr. Tripathi believes that "sometime during his reign Harṣa came into collision with the king of Sindha, and it resulted in the defeat of the latter."[184] The learned scholar feels that it was "a brilliant conclusion of hostilities," but Harṣa could not occupy Sindh permanently. It may be suggested that Harṣa might have allowed the defeated ruler to enjoy some amount of autonomy and the pilgrim, on that grounds, refers to him as the king of Sindh.

MŪLASTHĀNIPURA ? (MOU-LO-SAN-PU-LU)

"It was a dependency of the Che-ka (Ṭekka) country."[185]

PARVATA ? (PO-FA-TO)

This was another dependency of the Ṭekka country.

---

182. *Anc. Geog. of Ind.*, P. 488.
183. *Watters, II*, P. 252.
184. *THK.*, P. 114.
185. *Watters, II*, P. 254.

The destinies of these two dependencies must have been linked up with that of the Ṭekka kingdom itself which we have already referred to in the beginning of this chapter.

AUDUMBATĪRA (A-TIEN-P'O-CHIH-LO)

This country is not properly identified. According to Cunningham, it corresponded to "the fourth province of the Sindh kingdom which in the seventh century A.D. was Kachha,"[186] The pilgrim tells us that "the country had latterly been without a sovereign and was under Sindha."[187] Two other dependencies of Sindh were Pāṭāśila (Pi-to-shih-lo)[188] and Vichala (A-fan-t'u).[189]

These two dependencies along with Audumbatīra must have also been within the sphere of influence of Harṣa.

On the basis of above description we can say that Yuan Chwang had surveyed almost all kingdoms of his times. But we have to treat him with caution. On one hand he makes Harṣa "the lord of five Indias" and on the other, Harṣa was the king of Kanauj, without any dependencies being referred to in the accounts of the pilgrim. This does not mean that Harṣa was the ruler of only one kingdom of Kanauj. We have seen that the pilgrim observes silence about the rulers of several kingdoms. These kingdoms were certainly within the direct control of Harṣa. Explaining the pilgrim's silence, Dr. Tripathi has rightly observed that "he thought that Harṣa's dominions were too well known to need any explicit mention."[190] During the descriptions of various kingdoms above I have tried to explain that several of them which are said to have deen ruled by their respective rulers, were also within Harṣa's sphere of influence.

Like Yuan Chwang, Bāṇa has also shown us time and again that

---

186. *Anc. Geog. of Ind.*, P. 302.

187. *Watters, II*, P. 256.

188. *Anc. Geog. of Ind.*, *Pp.* 278*ff.*

189. *Cunningham identifies it with Middle Sindh with its capital at Brahmanabad. Ibid.*, P. 270.

190. *THK.*, P. 115,

Harṣa was the universal sovereign. We have to admit that Bāṇa has given exaggerated account of Harṣa's power and pelf and, as usual, we have to remain cautions in depending on Bāṇa.

Bāṇa tells us that the court of Prabhākaravardhana and Harṣa was attended by several feudatories and subservient kings. At Harṣa's birth we find "the wives of neighbourIng kings" who "could be observed in thousands approaching the palace from every side."[191] There were "old feudatories" lodged "in one place."[192] We find many feudatories who had assembled at the occasion of Rājyaśrī's marriage. Rājyavardhana is said to have been accompanied by "ancient advisers and devoted feudatories" when he went "towards the north to attack the Hūṇas."[193] At the time of Prabhākaravardhana's illness we find several kings "seated in the courtyard, distressed in mind at failing to obtain a sight of their sovereign : bathing, eating and sleeping had become mere names to them, and their clothes were foul from neglect of the toilet, while they passed day and night motionless as though pictured, awaiting bulletins from the king's personal attendants...."[194] Harsa's mother recalls to her memory the coronation ceremony when "the subservient wives of countless feudatories poured coronation water" upon her head.[195] Prabhākaravardhana's funeral was attended by several feudatories,[196] who remained at the capital for many days. They also took part in military expeditions led by Rājyavardhana and Harsa against 'the wicked lord of Mālvā" and Śaśāṅka. When Harṣa was busy in the search of his sister Rājyaśrī, we learn that "the search was carried on by deligent messengers every day" as commanded

---

191. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 111; राजकुलमागच्छन्ति समन्तात्सामन्तान्तः पुरसहस्राण्यदृश्यन्त। —हृ० च०, च० उच्छ०, पृ० ७।

192. *Ibid.*, *P.* 112.

193. *Ibid.*, *P.* 132.

194. *Ibid.*, *P.* 137. "अजिरोपविष्टैश्चानासादितस्वामिदर्शनदूयमानमानसैरभ्यन्तरनिष्पतितनिकटवर्तिपरिजननिवेद्यमानवार्तंवार्तीभूतस्नानभोजनशयनरुज्झितात्मसंस्कारमलिनवेशैर्लिखितैरिव।" —हृ० च०, पं० उच्छ०, पृ० २११

195. *Ibid.*, *P.* 153.

196. *Ibid.*, *P.* 158.

by the emperor.[197] When Bāṇa visited Harṣa's camp, he saw many subject-kings attending Harṣa. These kings and feudatories also participated in the festivities on the occasions such as Vasantotsava or 'Śaradotsava or Kaumadīmahotasva.[198]

Thus it becomes quite clear that Harṣa's sphere of influence was spread over quite wide and his supremacy was acknowledged in the entire Northern India. In our survey of Harṣa's expeditions we have seen that Kashmīr acknowledged his suzerainty. Nepāl was also included within the zone of his influence. Kāmarūpa was governed by king Bhāskaravarman who was very keen to win Harṣa's friendship. His hold over Magadha, Bengal, and Orissa is accepted by almost all. We can say that Harṣa followed the policy of Samudragupta and felt satisfied with the loyal subservience of many of his contemporary kings whom he allowed a tremendous amount of autonomy. In the south-western sector his influence cannot be doubted in Valabhī and Bharoach where the empire must have touched the Arabian sea and in south-eastern sector it touched the Bay of Bengal. And we can say that Bāṇa is not wholly incorrect when he refers to Harṣa as "the king of kings, the lord of four oceans and the leader of all emperors."[199] For achieving such political glory Harsa is known as "sakalottarāpathanātha" or "sakalottarāpatheśvara" in many south Indian inscriptions. Dr. Mookerji, on this basis, opines that Harsa "achieved the porud position of being the paramount sovereign of the whole of Northern India."[200] Dr. Tripathi, however, does not agree to such conclusions and has raised an objection to it.[201] He says that "the epithet does not bear any geographical significance," and "the expression 'sakalottarāpathnātha' was used in a

197. *Ibid., P.* 233.

198. *This we learn from Sūtradhāra in all three dramas of Harṣa.*

199. *HCCTH., P.* 40; चतुःसमुद्राधिपतेः सकलराजचक्रचूडामणि...... सर्वचक्रवर्तिनां धौरेयस्य महाराजाधिराजपरमेश्वरश्रीहर्षदेवस्य।

—हृ० च०, द्वि० उच्छ्व०, पृ० २३।

200. *Harsa., P.* 43.

201. *THK., Pp.* 120-21.

vague and loose way."[202] I most respectfully submit that the 'expression' is neither in Bāṇa's Harṣacharita nor in Yuan Chwang's account; but it is found in the south Indian inscriptions which are not very kind to the paramount ruler of the north and, therefore, it may, on the other hand, be cited emphatically in Harṣa's favour. With the description in the pages above I find that Harṣa was certainly the paramount ruler of the entire north who ruled over the greatest empire of his times. His empire included the territories of Kashmīr and Nepāl in north, and it touched the Narmadā as its southern border. In the north-west it included major portions of Punjab and Sindh and in west it touched the Bharoach coast and the Arabian sea. In north-east his suzerainty was acknowledged as far as the Brahmaputrā Valley and in the east the empire included Bengal. In the south-east the whole of Orissa was within the limits of his domain and it touched the Bay of Bengal. And thus his claim to the status of an emperor having sway over the entire Northern India appears well-founded.

---

202. *Ibid., P.* 121.

CHAPTER VII

ADMINISTRATION

It is difficult to agree with Dr. Beni Prasad who says that the "literary, epigraphic and numismatic evidence on ancient Indian History does not suffice to give an idea of the details of the system of administration of a given epoch."[1] Had it been so, it would not have been possible for several scholars, including Dr. Beni Prasad, to work on this subject. Not only administration but the entire historical study of Ancient India is based on the "literary, epigraphic and numismatic evidence." We have at our disposal the wonderful accounts of the system of administration of the Mauryas, the Guptas and the Puspabhūtis. Harsavardhana enjoyed a long reign of nearly four decades and ruled over a vast empire right from the Himālayas to the Narmadā and from Bharoach Saurāṣṭra region to Kāmarūpa, and we can say that it was largely due to his efficient administrative machinery. The sources at our disposal, literary, epigraphic and numismatic, combined with the Chinese pilgrim's accounts, give us a fine picture of the State as it was governed during the period under review, and one can hardly accept that "not much evidence is available regarding the administrative system which could leave the country free for pursuits of peace and religion."[2]

The State in ancient Indian polity was mainfested in the seven organs or constituents,[3] which strikingly correspond to the four main

1. *The Theory of Government in Ancient India, Allahabad,* 1927, *Pp.* 335-6.

2. *Mookerji, Harṣa, P.* 84. *Dr. Tripathi also opines that "our authorities on Harṣa unfortunately yield us meagre data for the then existing system of Government." THK., P.* 185.

3. *Arthaśāstra, VI,* 1, *tr. Samasastry, P.* 257; *MS., IV.* 249; *YS.,* 1. 353; *VDS., III.* 33. *M. Bh. Śānti Parva,* 54-69; *Also Kane, Hist. of Dharma-Śāstras, Vol. III, P.* 17.

constituents of the State of modern political thinkers. These seven constituents or the prakṛits, according to our ancient theoreticians of State and government, are given in the works on ancient Indian polity.[4] They are : 1. The King or the Sovereign; 2. The Council of Ministers or the Amātyas; 3. Janapada or the Territory; 4. The Durga or the Fort; 5. The Koṣa or the Treasury; 6. The Bala or the Army, and 7. The Mitra or the Allies.[5] These constituents of the State in Ancient India have close correspondence with the four main constituents of the State of modern times. The Harṣacharita and the Kādambarī and Harsa's dramas contain enough evidence to prove that great emphasis was laid upon all these constituents of the State to which we shall refer in course of our discussion.

1. *THE KING*

HARSA'S ADMINISTRATIVE IDEALS

Harsa was a benevolent ruler and his administrative ideal was the attainment of happiness for his people. The ideal kingship is well described by Harṣa in his Nāgānanda. He puts the following words in the mouth of Jīmūtavāhana, the hero of the drama.

"The subjects have been put to the right path; the good people have been well placed; relatives have been equal to me; security in the kingdom is guaranteed; the desire-fulfilling tree (*Kalpa-druma*) has been given to the needy i.e., all helps to those who are in need."[6]

---

4. *That the saptāṅga theory was popular during the period under review is proved by the Chammaka Copper Plate of Mahārāja Pravarasena II. The grant refers to his kingdom consisting of seven constituents. CII., III, No.* 55, *Pp.* 239, *lines,* 40-41.

5. *Ibid., III, P.* 17*; Bhandarkar, Some Aspects of Ancient Hindu Polity, P.* 65.

6. न्याय्ये वर्त्मनि योजिताः प्रकृतय. सन्तः सुखं स्थापिता।
नीतो बन्धुजनस्तथाऽऽत्मसमतां राज्ये च रक्षा कृता॥
दत्तो दत्तमनोरथाधिकफलः कल्पद्रुमोऽप्यर्थिने।
किं कर्तव्यमतः परं वद सखे यत्ते स्थितं चेतसि॥ —नागानंदम् १.७।

Similarly the king has been described as the protector of his subjects in the Kādambarī and the Harṣacharita. King Śūdraka combined in himself all the noble qualities of a king, dutiful, benevolent and noble ruler who did his best to please his subjects. King Tārāpīḍa is described as "the incarnation of justice and destroyer of the sorrows of his people."

The king was supposed to have attained divinity and was thought to have combined in himself all the noble qualities of several gods. Bāṇa refers to Puṣpabhūti, Prabhākaravardhana and Harṣa in a very magniloquent tone. He tells us that Pūṣpabhūti was like "Indra incarnate, Meru-like in the attribute of a golden nature, Mandara-like in attracting glory, ocean-like in observing proper bounds, moon-like in his receptivity for arts, Veda-like in truthful speech, earth-like in supporting all mankind, wind-like in sweeping away the bad passions of all kings, a Guru in speech, a Pṛithu in breast, a Viśāla in intellect, a Janaka in asceticism, a Suyātra in splendour, a Sumantra in secret council, a Budha in station, an Arjuna in brillinace, a Bhīṣma with a bow, a Niṣadha in frame, a Śatrughna in battle, a Śūra in vanquishing armies of heroes, a Daksa in fecundity."[7] In his "line were born kings free from the stain of violating Dharma, as living beings came from the commencement of the golden age;....embracing all beings, like the variations of existence sprung from Viṣṇu."[8]

Prabhākaravardhana is also said to have possessed similar noble qualities of gods and men. Coming to Harsa, Bāṇa's pen so portrays him that he possessed qualities superior to those possessed by famous heroes and gods. We are told that he was "more truly the lord of the Vāhinī than Śantanu,[9] more illustrious for victory than Bhīṣma, more delighting in the bow than Droṇa, more unerring with the arrow than Aśvatthāman, dearer to Mitra than Karṇa, more forbearing than Yudhiṣṭhira, possessing the might of more elephants than Bhīma, more worthy of figuring in the war

7. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 84; *HCK.*, *P.* 44.

8. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 101; *HCK.*, *4th canto*, *P.* 1.

9. *The learned editors have drawn our attention to puns here. Vāhinī means an army as well as the Gaṅgā who is said to be wife of Śantanu. Viṣṇu Purāṇa, IV.* 20; *HCCTH.*, *P.* 63, *fn.* 3 *and* 4.

of the Mahābhārata than Arjuna." He was "as it were the cause of the Golden Age, the source of the creation of gods, the native land of pride, the home of compassion, the close neighbour of Puruṣottaṁ,[10] the mine-mountain of valour, the assembly-room for all sciences to Sarasvatī...., the grave and gracious, the awe-inspiring and affable, at the same moment, a holiday and a holy day, the universal monarch."[11] We are told further that he was the 'union of separate glories, noble in birth and of well-chosen name, the lord of the field bounded by four oceans, the enjoyer of all the fruits of Brahmā's pillar, the world, the surpasser of all the victories won by all kings of ancient times. Through him the earth does indeed possess a true King....; his freaks of power cause no offence to the man of refinement as did those of Śiva; his boasts lead to no destruction of families as did those of Indra to that of the cowpens; unlike Yama, he is not too fond of weilding the rod of punishment; unlike Varuṇa, his treasure-houses are not guarded by thousands of pitiless sea-monsters; unlike Kuvera, seeking an interview with him is never fruitless; unlike Jina, the sight of him is never without solid result; unlike the moon, his glories do not wane. Wonderful is his royalty, surpassing the gods.^ His liberality cannot find range in suppliants, nor his knowledge in doctires to be learned; his poetical skill finds words fail, as his valour lacks opportunities to exercise it; his energy wants scope and his fame sighs for a wider horizon: his kindly nature seeks in vain more hearts to win, his virtues exhaust the power of number

---

10. *The learned editors have drawn our attention to a pun here. It also means "possessing more land." HCCTH., P. 69, fn. 9. But here the author must have meant the meaning we adopted in the thesis above.*

11. *HCCTH., P.* 63-4.शन्तनोर्महावाहिनीपतिम् भीष्माज्जितकाशिनम् द्रोणाच्चापलालसम्, गुरुपुत्रादमोघमार्गणम्, कर्णान्मित्रप्रियम् युधिष्ठिराद्बहुक्षमम्, भीमादनेकनागायुतबलम्, धनंजयान्महाभारतरणयोग्यम्, कारणमिव कृतयुगस्य, बीजमिव विबुधसर्गस्य, उत्पत्तिद्वीपमिव दर्पस्य, एकागारमिव करुणायाः, प्रातिवेशिकमिव पुरुषोत्तमस्य, खनिपर्वतमिव पराक्रमस्य, सर्वविद्यासंगीतकगृहमिव सरस्वत्याः......सर्वप्रजापतीनाम्, गम्भीरं च प्रसन्नं च त्रासजननं च रमणीयं च कौतुकजननं च पुण्यं च चक्रवर्तिनं हर्षमद्राक्षीत्।

—ह० च०, द्वि० उ०, पृ० ३५।

and all the fine arts are too narrow a field for his genius."[12] To crown all he is described as "Dharma incarnate."[13]

Thus we find that Bāṇa not only compares his patron Harṣa with Indra, Varuṇa, Kuvera, Yama etc. but he tries to portrary his accomplishments as if he (Harṣa) excelled all these heroes and gods. This is, no doubt, an exaggerated account, but it throws enough light on the nature of kingship. The king was regarded a rare combination of all the noble, supernatural and superhuman qualities of several heroes and gods in order to be an ideal king and the history of Harṣa proves that he was an ideal ruler who combined in himself piety and compassion, love and fraternity. He certainly punished the enemies but showed charity to the mankind. He entertained all the noble ideals of a true Hindu sovereign.

His ideals of government, as it was administered by him, are best represented in his dramas. The king Vatsarāja Udayana, the hero of Harṣa in his two dramas, the Priyadarśikā and the Ratnāvalī, says in the Ratnāvalī :

"The kingdom has all its enemies vanquished; the entire burden of administration has been entrusted to a suitable (prime)minister: the subjects, with all disturbances entirely removed, are fondled with proper protection."[14]

---

12. *HCCTH.*, *Pp.* 64-65; सोऽयं सुजन्मा सुगृहीतनामा तेजसां राशिः चतुरुदधिकेदारकुटुम्बी भोक्ता ब्रह्मस्तम्भफलस्य सकलादिराजचरितजयज्येष्ठमल्लो देवः परमेश्वरो हर्षः। एतेन च खलु राजन्वती पृथ्वी, नास्य हरेरिव वृषविरोधीनि बालचरितानि, न पशुपतेरिव दक्षोद्वेगकारीण्यैश्वर्यविलसितानि, न शतक्रतोरिव गोत्रविनाशपिशुनाः प्रवादाः न यमस्येवातिवल्लभानि दण्डग्रहणानि, न वरुणस्येव निस्त्रिंशग्राहसहस्ररक्षिता रत्नालयाः, न धनदस्येव निष्फलाः सन्निधिलाभाः, न जिनस्येवार्थवादशून्यानि दर्शनानि, न चन्द्रमस इव बहुलदोषोपहताः श्रियः। चित्रमिदमत्यपरं राजत्वम्। अपि चास्य त्यागस्यार्थिनः, प्रज्ञायाः शास्त्राणि, कवित्वस्य वाचः, सत्त्वस्य साहसस्थानानि, उत्साहस्य व्यापाराः, कीर्तेर्दिङ्मुखानि, अनुरागस्य लोकहृदयानि, गुणगणस्य संख्या, कौशलस्य कला, न पर्याप्तो विषयः। —हृ० च०, द्वि० उ०, पृ० ३५।

13. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 208. 'धर्मः प्रत्यक्षो देवः'। —हृ० च०, स० उ०, पृ० ५९।

14. *Ratnāvalī*, *I.* 9.

राज्यं निर्जितशत्रु योग्य न्यस्तः समस्तो भरः।
सम्यक्पालन लालिताः प्रशमिताशेषोपसर्गाः प्रजाः॥

Similarly he tells us in the Priyadarśikā :

"I am convinced of the constancy of my servitors, I have seen the wisdom of my councilors, I have also proved my friends and know full well the devotion of my people."[15]

These references show that the matters relating to the subjects and the State, the protection of the people, their welfare and good administration mattered the king first, and the personal pleasures and ambitions were of secondary importance to him.

In the Nāgānanda also the king's duties are well defined. On being pursuaded and being convinced to leave the forest and to come back to attend to the affairs of the State and Government, Jīmūtavāhana says that he had done all that was to be done in his capacity as a king.[16] The king must have the strength to defend his subjects from all dangers. Harṣa describes his hero Vatsarāja Udayana as "one who was able to defend the whole world."[17]

These various references in the literary sources prove that, first of all, the king was the upholder of Daṇḍa and Dharma. Secondly, it was his main task to maintain law and order in the State; to protect the country from internal disorder and external dangers; to protect the people

---

15. *Priyadarśikā*, 1.6. *Pp.* 10-11.
मृत्यानामविकारता परिगता द्रष्टा मतिमन्त्रिणा।
मित्राण्यप्युपलक्षितानि विदितः पौरानुरागोऽधिकम्॥ प्रियदर्शिका, १.६।

16. *Nāgānandam*, 1.7. *The chamberlain further affirms to the duties of a king. He says :*

"Afflicted by the old age attending to the functions of the harem and guarding myself against stumblings at every step, I, under the guidance of this staff, now imitate every action of a king who establishes order in the cities and avoids lapses at every step by following the policy of punishment."

अन्तः पुराणां विहितव्यवस्थः पदेऽहं स्खलितानि रक्षन्।
जरातुरः संप्रति दण्डनीत्या सर्वं नृपस्यानुकरोमि वृत्तम्॥
नागानंदम् ४.१।

17. 'सकलपृथ्वी परित्राण (समर्थेन वत्सराजेन) समर्थः वत्सराजः।'
—प्रियदर्शिका, पृ० ३२-३।

against all dangers, and to do everything within his powers for the material, moral and spiritual uplift of the people. Thirdly, he had to guarantee just and efficient administration and administer justice to all irrespective of status, sex and creed.

THREE REGAL POWERS OF THE STATE

To fulfil these aims and objects the king depended on three great regal powers of the State. They are : the sovereignty or the majesty of the king himself (Prabhu śakti), the wise counsel (Mantra śakti), and the energy, power or strength (Utsāha śakti). These three powers thus correspond to the three major limbs of the Government, the Sovereign, the Council of Ministers, and the Army. These powers are not only essential, but they are indispensable and irresistible powers. Harṣa knew fully the importance of these three constituents or elements of the regal power and he worked out the details of his administrative scheme in such an order that equal emphasis was laid on all these elements. This is clear from his drama, the Priyadarśikā, wherein he tells us that king Dṛḍhava rmana, the ruler of Aṅga country, was "the possessor of three irresistible powers" (*śaktitryasya*).[18]

Bāṇa also refers to these constituents of the regal power in a very true sense of the term. Referring to the king Tārāpīḍa as "an incarnation of justice and destroyer of the sorrows of the people," he tells us that he (Tārāpīḍa) "reaped the fruits of these three powers.'[19]

That these constituents of regal power were regarded very important and indispensable during the age of Harṣa, is further proved by their reference in the Aihole inscription of Pulakeśin II.[20] They were not merely

18. *Priyadarśikā, Act I, Pp.* 8-9; *Monier-williams, Pp.* 1044-5.
19. *Kādambarī, tr. Ridding, P.* 48.
20. *Ep. Ind., Vol. VI, Pp.* 1-12.

उत्साहप्रभुमंत्रशक्तिसहिते यस्मिन्समस्ता दिशो
जित्वा भूमिपतीन्विसृज्य महितानाराध्य देवद्विजान् (।)
वातापीन्नगरीम् प्रविश्य नगरीमेकामिवोर्व्वि (र्व्वी) मिमाम्
चंचन्नीरधि (धि) नीलनीरपरिखां सत्याश्रये शासति ।। (३२)

political ideals, but were a living reality acted upon practically in the administration.

That Harṣa made sincere attempts to give good and efficient government and ensure justice, is further corroborated by the Chinese pilgrim, Yuan Chwang. He tells us : "He (Harṣa) was just in his administration, and punctilious in the discharge of his duties." To achieve it, "he forgot sleep and food in his devotion to good work."[21]

DAILY ROUTINE

In order to make the best efforts for the fullest fulfilment of his administrative aims and ideals he followed a strict daily routine like Aśoka.[22] We are told by the pilgrim that "the king's days were divided into three periods, of which one was given up to affairs of government, and two were devoted to religious works. He was indefatigable, and the day was too short for him."[23] The literary and epigraphic sources also corroborate what the pilgrim says about the routine of the king. They do not make a particular reference to the three-fold division of the king's time-table but they certainly reveal that the king was always busy in dealing with the matters related to his government and other benevolent activities.

EMPEROR'S VISITS

As the king was the central and most important figure in the administration the accomplishment of his administrative ideals and sucessful implementation of his State policies and decrees solely depended on his personal supervision.[24] It was, therefore, necessary for Harṣa to devote

---

21. *Watters, I, Pp.* 343-44.

22. *Ibid., I, P.* 344. *Like Aśoka he is also said to have "caused the use of animal food to cease throughout the Five Indias, and he prohibited the taking of life under severe penalities."*

23. *Ibid., I, P.* 344.

24. *Dr. Mookerji rightly observed that several religious activities and peaceful pursuits in the reign of Harṣa testify to the administrative "efficiency in maintaining peace and order and abolishing all sources of political troubles. . . ."*

nearly one-third of a day "to the affairs of the Government." In order to have personal knowledge of the conditions of the State and affairs of the government he travelled the entire empire and made on-the-spot study.

The Chinese pilgrim informs us, "The king also made visits of inspection throughout his dominion, not residing long at any place but having temporary buildings erected for his residence at each place of sojourn," and he did not go abroad during the three months of the Rain-season Retreat."[25]

This was, most probably, due to the difficulty in movements during rains. These tours of the emperor were not merely the formal and joyful trips. Harṣa was sincere in his motives and used these opportunities to listen to difficulties of his people. We are told, "If there was any irregularity in the manners of the people of the cities, he went amongst them,"[26] and took effective steps "to punish the evil doers and reward the good."

That the people could talk to him about their miseries and sorrows, is further corroborated by Bāṇa. The latter tells us that during Harṣa's march against Śaśāṅka, the people came to Harṣa with several presents. They also utilized this opportunity to complain against the wrongs done to them. The importance of the reference is further emphasised if we keep it in mind that the primary task of that visit of Harṣa was to go to punish the Gauḍa king, but he also utilized the opportunity to listen to the grievances of his people.

"Its success was inevitably due, very largely, to the king himself, to his realization of, and capacity to carry out, the duties and responsibilities attaching to his position as the head of the administration in charge of extensive empire." Harṣa, P. 84. *Similarly Dr. Tripathi opines that "in an oriental despotism the sovereign being the centre of the State much of success in administration necessarily depends on his benevolent example. . . . and laborious attention to details in order to infuse life into the governmental machinery and to check the corruption and laxity of officers placed in authority over distant areas." THK., P.* 132. *Also see HMHI., I, Pp.* 150-151; *G. S. Chatterjee, Harṣavardhana, Pp.* 258*ff.*

25. *Watters, I,* 344.

26. *Beal, I, P.* 215.

We are told, that "the whole country-side had come in eager haste from both directions out of curiosity to see the king, and fools of grant-holders, issuing from the villages on the route and headed by the aged elders with uplifted water-pots, pressed furiously near in crowds with presents of curds, molasses, candied sugar, and flowers in baskets."[27]

Coming to their problems and grievances we learn that some demanded "protection of the crops" whereas others approached their beloved monarch "with cries of 'the Labour is ours but when pay-time comes some other rascals will appear." We are told of the "village servants, set to scare on the feeble oxen tripping at every step." The people could speak frankly, freely and fearlessly ignoring the "terror of irate and savage chamberlains;" they could talk to their sovereign "in spite of distance, tripping, and falling" and "kept their eyes fixed upon the king, bringing to light imaginary wrongs of former governors, lauding hundreds of past officials, reporting ancient misdeeds of knaves."[28] But the whole crowed was not merely a gathering of disgruntled, aggrieved and frustrated people, it also included a large number of persons who were satisfied with Harṣa's government. That the people consisted of both types of people, some satisfied with the state of affairs of Harṣa's government and others unhappy for certain wrongs done to them, will be very clear from the passage quoted below :

The people, "contented with the appointed overseers, were bawling their eulogies :—'The king is Dharma incarnate'; others, despondent at the plunder of their ripe grain, had come forth wives and all to bemoan their estates, and to the imminent risk of their lives, grief dismissing fear, had begun to censure their sovereign, crying 'Where's the king ?' 'What right has he to be king ?' 'What a king '!"[29]

This passage from the Harṣacharita shows that all the people could

---

27. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 208.

28. *Ibid.*, *P.* 208.

29. *Ibid.*, *Pp.* 208-209, "धर्मः प्रत्यक्षो देवः" इति स्तुतीरातन्वद्भिरपरूलं-यमाननिष्पन्नसस्यप्रकटितविषदैः क्षेत्रशुचा सकुटुम्बरव निर्गतैः प्ररूढप्राणच्छेदैः परितापत्याजित-भयैः "क्व राजा कुतो राजा कीदृशो वा राजा।" —ह० च०, स० उ०, पृ० ५८।

express their grievances without any hesitation, and the emperor, on his part, allowed his people utmost liberty so that they could talk to him of their joys and sorrows with a hope that the sovereign would do his best to undo the wrongs done to them and would guarantee peace, prosperity, righteousness, and justice.

Harṣa's personal interest in making tours of the country and acquiring first-hand information about his people must have started with his first excursion which he had undertaken along with his elder brother while marching to fight the Hūṇas. At that time he must have come into touch with the people and must have thought the necessity of frequent tours of the country. He had several other occasions of touring the country in course of his marches against the enemies. These marches included his expeditions against the rulers of Mālvā, Gauḍa, Bādāmi, Valabhī, Orissā, Kashmīr, Nepāl and other places. After these military expeditions he must have started peaceful journeyings to which both Yuan Chwang and Bāṇa refer to in detail. When the pilgrim was in India, "the emperor was visiting the different parts of his empire." Harṣa is said to have first heard of the pilgrim while he was "on an expedition to a country called 'Kung-yü-ta', and was on his way back to Kanauj to hold a great Buddhist assembly there. Hearing of the arrival of the Chinese pilgrim at the court of king Kumāra, he sent a summons to the latter to repair to him with his foreign guest."[30] The pilgrim tells us that Harṣa "in his progress to "East India" visited Kie (ka)-chu-wen (?)-k'i-lo country and "held his court there."[31] For these halts he got constructed "temporary buildings erected for his residence at each place of sojourn."[32] Similarly, we are told that during his visit to Ka-chu-wen (?) "country he cut grass to make huts," but we do not understand as to why he "burned these (huts) when leaving."[33]

Bāṇa supplements to what Yuan Chwang says in his description of these tours. Harṣa undertook these visits with great pomp and show.

30. *Watters, I, P.* 349.
31. *Ibid. II Pp.* 182-3.
32. *Ibid., I, P.* 344.
33. *Ibid., II, P.* 182.

When Bāṇa visited the emperor Harṣa, the latter was staying at his royal camp "pitched near Maṇitāra along the Ajiravati river." Bāṇa draws a graphic and vivid picture of the royal camp.[34] He "proceeded leisurely with Mekhalaka, the royal messenger, to the royal gate, one by one observing the many camps of the renowned subject kings."[35] As soon as he reached the royal gate he found it "all dark with crowds of elephants" and "the place seemed in waves with the plunging horses" and "troops of camels." Other parts were full of "white umbrellas" and "thousands of stirring chowries." Bāṇa tells us further that "the camp was filled on every side with conquered hostile vassal-chiefs, some who could not find admission hung down their heads" and others felt "honoured even in being conquered, and destitute of every other refuge, continually asking the servants of the different domestic porters who at intervals made their exits and their entrances." There were also "other kings" who had "come from the desire of seeing his (Harṣa's) glory and natives of various countries, who were waiting for the time when he would be visible."

As Harṣa was a liberal patron of art and culture he also extended his generosity to the followers of various sects at his court. They were also present at the camp. Among them were the "Jains, Ārhatas, Pāśupatas, mendicants of the School of Parāśarya and the Brāhmaṇa students." The camp was also full of natives of every land, and savages from every forest. At such camps Harṣa also appears to have met the diplomatic envoys. We are told that there were also "ambassadors from every foreign country."[36] When Bāṇa reached the gate, he was asked by the messenger

---

34. *HCCTH.*, *Pp.* 46-64. *These camps were of two types. Firstly, the general camps for king's stay while he was on tour. They were known as Skandhāvāras. Second category was of the victory camps known Jayaskandhāvāras. Harṣa's two grants were issued from his victory camps.*

35. *HCCTH.*, P. 46. "भूभुजि प्रख्यातानां क्षितिभुजां बहून्शिबिरसंनिवेशान्वी-क्षमाणः शनैः शनैः" —हृ० च०, द्वि० उ०, पृ० २७।

36. *That Harṣa "maintained diplomatic intercourse" with foreign countries, is a fact. Smith has drawn our attention to Harṣa's ambassadorial relations with China. Harṣa dispatched "a Brāhmaṇa envoy to the emperor of China in 641.*

to wait for a short while and he returned with "the chief of all the door-keepers, the king's special favourite Pariyātra. The latter welcomed Bāṇa, saluted him and "addressed him respectfully in a gentle voice." He told Bāṇa that His Highness Harṣa was willing to see him. This makes it clear that, like a palace, the camp was also not open to all. The visiters to the camp were regularised by rules.[37]

Bāṇa "next beheld a stable filled with the king's favourite horses from Vanāyu, Āraṭṭa, Kamboja, Bharadvāja, Sindha, and Persia." This shows that Harṣa's favourite horses were lodged in a special stable near the gate of the camp. Soon after, "on his left hand," he saw, "an elephant stable" along with "a special pavilion" for Darpaśāta, Harṣa's "favourite elephant, his external heart."[38] Bāṇa was so much interested in seeing the elephant that he forgot his primary aim and was told by the door-keeper that he would "have another opportunity of seeing him." Bāṇa, in response to this request and, "following the path indicated by the door-keeper,

---

He is said to have returned in 643, accompanied by a Chinese mission bearing a reply to Harṣa's dispatch." In 646 the ambassador was succeeded by Wang-hiuen-tse, the second in command of the earlier Embassy. But after Harṣa's death about the end of the year 646 or the beginning of the year 647 A.D., the country faced political chaos and disorder. His Minister "usurped the throne, and took the field with 'barbarian' troops against the Chinese mission. The members of the escort were massacred, or taken prisoners, and the property of the mission, including the articles presented by Indian kings, were plundered, but the envoys, Wang-hiuen-tse and his colleagues, were fortunate enough to escape into Nepāl by night." EHI., 4th Ed., P. 366; THK., P. 132.

37. *Both Bāṇa and Harṣa offer innumerable examples of regularised palace-entry. None could enter the palace without permission. This was also applicable to the entry to the camp. HCCTH., Pp. 111ff; Kādambarī, tr. Ridding, Pp. 122ff.*

38. *The Banskhera and Madhubana inscriptions corroborate what Bāṇa says about the presence of horses and elephants. These inscriptions also refer to boats in addition to horses and elephants. This proves that Harṣa also maintained a fleet along with Infantry, Cavalry, Elephant and Camel corps.*

passed through three courts crowded with subject-kings, and in the fourth he saw king Harṣa, in an open space in front of a pavilion where he used to give audience after eating." The emperor "was sitting on a throne made of a stone clear like a pearl, washed with sandal-wood water." Such was the grandeur of the royal camp of Harṣa.

This description is further corroborated by the pilgrim who terms these royal camps as "travelling palaces" or "pavilions of travel"[39] with all amenities and luxuries of the palaces along with the entire royal paraphernalia. Similar camps were also stationed at Prayāga where Harṣa held his quinquennial distributions every five years. "The king", we are told, "went in state from Kanauj to this place."[40] This "customary quinquennial great distribution of gifts, and alms, and offerings" was attended by "the kings of eighteen kingdoms", and "a huge concourse of people amounting to about 500,000." They included "the Śramaṇas, Heretics, Nirgranthas, the poor, the orphans, and the solitary (breaved) of the Five Indias." We are told that "many scores of thatched buildings," and "several hundred storehouses" were constructed in addition to several "pavilions for refreshments" and "some hundred or so long buildings" to accommodate "the thousands of visitors."[41] The camps of the emperor Harṣa and his royal guests and allies were in the vicinity of this temporary but grand and well-planned township. Harṣa's inscriptions further prove that the emperor was on constant tour of his empire. Both the Banskhera and Madhubana grants were issued from the royal camps at Vardhamānakoṭi and Kaptthikā respectively. Several grants of the period under review are known to have been issued from such camps pitched either on the occasions of military expeditions or general tours.

HIS TITLES

The king assumed several high-sounding titles, such as Paramabhaṭṭāraka, Rājā, Nṛipa, Mahārāja, Mahārājādhirāja, Chakravartin,

39. *Life*, P. 173.
40. *Watters*, *I*. *P*. 364.
41. *Life*, P. 185.

Parameśvara or Deva, Paramadaivatā, Samrāṭ, Aikādhirāja Mahādhirāja and Sārvabhaum etc. Of all these titles Rājā or Nṛipa or Mahārāja was used by Harṣa's ancestors up to the times of Prabhākaravardhana. They indicate that their political status was not completely independent. Other titles were assumed by Prabhākaravardhana, Harṣa and their contemporaries. Bāṇa assigns him (*Prabhākaravardhana*) the title of rājādhirāja whereas he is known as Mahārājādhirāja in the epigraphic records of Harṣa; but Bāṇa gives the title of Mahārājādhirāja to Susthiravarman of the Varman dynasty of Kāmarūpa and this shows that these titles were not used in a very strict and significant sense. Harṣa assumed such titles as Deva, Parameśvara, Chakravartin,[42] Paramabhaṭṭāraka and Mahārājādhirāja.[43] Parameśvara[44] was also a common title assumed along with

---

42. *They figure quite prominently in Bāṇa's Harṣacharita. Harṣa himself assigns this title to Vidyādhara prince Jīmūtavāhana, a hero of his drama Nāgānandaṁ, Pp.* 28-9. *This shows its importance. The reference further suggests that the title of Chakravartin was bestowed upon Yuvarāja after he wore the crown. On the basis of epigraphic evidence it appears that during the period under review only one ruler assumed this title. He was Dharsena IV,* (*c.A.D.* 641-650), *son of Dhruvasena II and grand-son of Harṣa who is given this title in the Alina Copper-plate of Śilāditya VII of the year A.D.* 766-67. *CII., III, No.* 39, *P.* 183. *Referring to this Fleet opines that the title of "Chakravartin, which, not being assumed by any of his successors, may perhaps indicate that his power was more extensive than theirs ever was." Ibid., III, P.* 134, *fn.* 1., *also P.* 183, *fn.* 4. *The word literally means "a ruler, the wheels* (*chakra*) *of whose chariot roll every where without obstruction, emperor, sovereign of the world, ruler of a Chakra* (*or Country*) *described as extending from sea to sea." Monier-williams, P.* 381.

43. *These titles are assigned to Prabhākaravardhana, Rājyavardhana II and Harṣa in the Banskhera and Madhubana inscritpions.*

44. *This title "is almost always coupled with two others." CII., III, P.* 10, *fn.* 3. *Fleet has drawn our attention to one Rewa grant of Trailokyamalla, dated* 1297. *The donor considered it unnecessary to give all three titles in full, and felt satisfied with "paramabhaṭṭārakety ādir āvalitrayopeta," "possessed of the*

two other titles of Paramabhaṭṭāraka and Mahārājādhirāja. Though it is not found in Harṣa's inscriptions, it is assumed by two important contemporaries of Harṣa, namely Pulakeśin II and Dharasena IV. Paramadaivatā occurs in the Dāmodarapur copper-plate inscription of Kumāragupta I.[45] The title of Samrāṭ is assigned to Yaśodharmana in his Mandsaur stone pillar inscription.[46] Aikādhirāja is attributed to king Chandra in the Maharaulī posthumous iron pillar inscription of king Chandra.[47] Harṣa uses the title of Sārvabhauma in his drama Ratnāvalī. Yaugandharāyaṇa informs the king that a prophet made a forecast about the princess of Ceylon that "whoever would accept her hand (in marriage) he would be a sovereign king."[48]

EDUCATION IMPARTED TO PRINCES

In order to train the princes for the task ahead they were given proper education and training. Rājyavardhana and Harṣa were trained in the affairs of the state and craft of war. The education which is said to have been imparted to prince Chandrapīḍa covered almost all branches of learning necessary for an ideal king. The princes were always taught and advised to pay respect to seniors, to honour the Brāhmaṇas and to protect the people.[49] The advice which Śukanāsa gave to Chandrapīḍa, on the eve of his anointation ceremony, is one of the most valuable pieces of Bāṇa's works. It included the duties of a king which he must fulfil as

---

three kingly titles (lit. succession) commencing with Paramabhaṭṭāraka. Ibid., III, P. 10, *fn.* 3.

45. *Ep. Ind., Vol. XV, P.* 113.

46. *CII., III, No.* 33, *Pp.* 146-7. *One "who rules over kings and performs the Rājasūya sacrifice," is entitled to this title.*

47. *Ibid., III, No.* 32, *Pp.* 141-2.

48. 'इयं सिहलेश्वरदुहिता सिद्धेनादिष्टा यथा यास्याः पाणिं गृहीष्यति स सार्वभौमो राजा भविष्यति।'

49. आनंदय बन्धुवर्गम् पूजय द्विजातीन्, परिपालय प्रजाम्। कादम्बरी, संपा० परब, पृ० १७२।

a ruler. It also included a warning against the evils which would creep into king's life if proper care is not taken at proper time.[50]

CORONATION CEREMONY

Coronation ceremony is a time-honoured ceremony associated with the institution of kingship from the days of the early Vedic period. Gradually it became "elaborate, ritualistic and very technical," and "every Hindu sovereign crowned in India has observed them, for according to the orthodox view of both law and ritual, no one could attain kingship without them."[51]

That the ceremony was also observed during the period under review, is proved by the evidences at our disposal. In almost all the Maitraka inscriptions, Droṇasiṁha (c.A.D. 499-519) is referred to as "one whose coronation ceremony was performed in the presence of the paramount sovereign himself."[52] Bāṇa makes it clear that Prabhākaravardhana was duly coronated at a ceremony. The queen Yaśomatī tells Harṣa that "upon her head the subservient wives of countless feudatories poured coronation water from golden evers."[53] The importance attached to the ceremony is amply proved by the example of Harṣa's own coronation. There was no time to perform the ceremony with pomp and show; but he is said to have performed it before he marched against the enemies. When all the preparations for the expedition were over, "an hour of marching suitable for the subjugation of all the four quarters" was fixed on an auspicious day "calculated and approved by a troop of astronomers numbering hundreds." On that day Harṣa got up in the morning and "with deep devotion offered worship" to Śiva; offered several gifts to the Brāhmaṇas and then "set upon the throne with a coverlet of tiger skin; duly anointed first his bow and then his body down to the feet with sandal;" ". . . .put on two seemly robes of bark silk marked with pairs of flamingos; formed about his head a chaplet of white flowers" and other paraphernalia.

---

50. *Kādambarī, tr. Ridding, Pp.* 76-84; *cf. Arthaśāstra, Pp.* 36-41.
51. *K. P. Jayaswal, Hindu Polity, P.* 192.
52. 'अखिलभुवनमण्डलैकस्वामिना परमस्वामिना स्वयमोपहित राज्याभिषेकः।'
53. *HCCTH., P.* 153.

Then started the sprinkling ceremony. "After being sprinkled on the head with a spray of lustral water scattered by the hand of the highly honoured and delighted Purohita, he had sent away valuable equipages, and divided among the kings the ornaments,....had loosened the prisoners, and bestowed suitable gifts of favour upon distressed pilgrims and nobles."[54] This shows that the ceremony was fully, ritualistically and technically performed in which the chief queen also participated. The several other details of the coronation ceremony are also preserved in the Kādambarī of Bāṇa to which a brief reference is necessary. Tārāpīḍa performed the coronation ceremony of his son Chandrapīḍa. On an auspicious day fixed for the ceremony, the king surrounded by thousands of guests and feudatory chiefs, raised aloft the vessel of consecration water and himself anointed his son. The rest of the rites and rituals were performed by the family priest. The consecration water was brought from all holy places, rivers and oceans. After the sprinkling of coronation water the prince was anointed by his mother from head to foot. Then he went to the assembly-hall where he mounted the royal throne and received the due homages and tributes from the feudatories. These proceedings, we are told, were accompanied by the sound of auspicious drums.[55]

---

54. *HCCTH., Pp.* 197-8. केषुचिद्दिवसेषु मौहूर्तिकमण्डलेन शतशः सुगणिते सुप्रशस्ते हनि दत्ते चतसृणामपि दिशां विजययोग्ये दण्डयात्रालग्ने सलिलमोक्षविशारदैः शारदैरिवाम्भोधरैः कालधौतैः शातकौम्भश्च कुम्भैः स्नात्वा विरचय्य परमया भक्त्या भगवतो नीललोहितस्यार्चामुदर्चिषं हुत्वा प्रदक्षिणावर्तशिखाकलापमाशुशुक्षणिं दत्त्वा द्विजेभ्यो रत्नवन्ति राजतानि जातरूपमयानि च सहस्रशस्तिलपात्राणि कनकपत्रलतालङ्कृतशफम्शृ शिखरा गाश्चार्बुदशः समुपविश्य विततव्याघ्रचर्मणि भद्रासने विलिप्य प्रथमविलिप्तायुधो निजयशोधवलेनाचरणतश्चन्दनेन शरीरं परिधाय राजहंसमिथुनलक्ष्मणी सदृशे दुकूले परमेश्वरचिह्नभूतां शशिकलामिव कल्पयित्वा सितकुसुममुण्डालिकां शिरसि नीत्वा कर्णाभरणमरकतमयूखमिव कर्णगोचरतां गोरोचनाच्छुरितमभिनवं दूर्वापल्लवं विन्यस्य सह शासनवलयेन गमनमङ्गलप्रतिसरं प्रकोष्ठे परिपूजितप्रहृष्टपुरोहितकरप्रकीर्यमाणशान्तिसलिलसीकरनिकराभ्युक्षितशिराः सम्प्रेष्य महार्हाणि वाहनानि बहलरत्नालोकलिप्तककुम्भि च भूषणानि भूभुजां संविभज्य क्लिष्टकार्पटिककुलपुत्रशलोकमाचितैः प्रसाददानैश्च विमुच्य बन्धनानि। —हृ० च०, स० उ०, पृ० ५३।

55. *Kādambari, tr. Ridding, Pp.* 83-5.

KING AND HIS PALACE LIFE

Some idea of the palace-life can be had from the life at the royal camps to which a reference has already been made. To quote the Chinese pilgrim they were the "travelling palaces." In fact the palaces must have excelled the luxury and comforts which could be provided at the camps, and the palace life must have been extraordinarily grand and luxurious.

PALACE RETINUES

The king and the queen had their separate personal retinues. It included several domestic servants and maid-servants. They included the chief-door-keeper (mahāpratihārī), other attendants (pratihārījana), chowry-bearers (chāmaragrāhiṇīs), betel-bearers (Tāṁbulakaraṅkavāhinīs) and various other servants including a large number of dwarfs, hunchbacks and deaf persons.[56] Both males and females were recruited to work at the palaces but the majority was that of women attendants.

INSIGNIAS OF ROYALTY

The assignments of bearing the chowry and offering betels were very important in the court-life, and were generally entrusted to women, some-times to women of higher status. The chowry-bearers and umbrella-bearers were treated with respect as they were entrusted to bear the chowry and the umbrella, the insignias of royalty.[57] We are told in the Harṣacharita that Bhāskaravarman, the king of Kāmarūpa, had presented to Harṣa an umbrella, named Ābhoga. The latter was sent to Harṣa "to add substance to his message." It was "derived from Varuṇa, a family heirloom." The umbrella is said to have possessed "many wonder-moving miracles and Harṣa is said to have been "delighted at the sight of the umbrella as a fair omen on his first march."[58] But these insignias of royalty were put off on sad occasions. Harṣa is said to have come to the royal

56. *HCCTH., Pp.* 111*ff; Kādambari, tr. Ridding, Pp.* 122*ff.*
57. *HCCTH., Pp.* 61*ff.; Kādambari, tr. Ridding, Pp.* 28-29.
58. *HCCTH., Pp.* 212-6.

palace without an umbrella and with none to clear his path when he returned after the funeral bath.

PALACE GUARD

Palace was well-guarded and the entry to it was strictly controlled. It was limited to a very few and trusted people. These rules were also observed at the royal camps. We are told in the Harṣacharita that when Prabhākaravardhana fell ill, only physicians, advisers, family priests, Brāhmaṇas, chowry-bearers and the chief body-guard were allowed access to him.[59] Bāṇa further makes it clear that the palace door was shut to all except a few loving friends.[60] But we must remember that it was the time when the king was seriously ill and the atmosphere must have been tense and gloomy. On the festive occasions and other celebrations we do not find such restrictions. At the birth-celebrations of Rājyavardhana and Harṣa we find frequent and unrestricted movement in the palace. Similarly the festivals, as we find in the dramas of Harṣa, were celebrated with great merry-making and the people freely participated in those festivals at the palaces.

KING'S DAILY ROUTINE

We have already seen that the time-table of the king was chalked out and the day was divided into three equal parts. Here we propose to refer to his routine as we find in our literary sources. The daily routine of the king was inaugurated with the sound of conch in the early morning at the porch of the royal palace. This was followed by the sound of various musical instruments, beating of the drums and songs of troubadours. Skilled musicians and reciters of verses were employed at the courts.[61] Thus the king was used to leave the bed with the sound of music and started his day with pleasant and light exercise in the royal gymnasium with

---

59. *Ibid.*, P. 138.

60. *Ibid.*, P. 138.

61. *Kādambarī, tr. Ridding*, P. 152; *HCCTH.*, P. 135.

the persons of his age.[62] Soon after the exercise was over the king took his bath. The literature of this period gives us a beautiful account of king's bath which had also caught the attention of the Chinese pilgrim. The latter says, "when the king goes to his bath there is the music of drums and stringed instruments and songs."[63] This was followed by worship.[64] In his description the pilgrim is fully corroborated by Bāṇa[65] and Harṣa himself. After the worship was over, we are further told, the limbs of the king were anointed with sandal perfumed with the fragrance of saffron, camphor and musk. Then he changed his dress and took the work of the day.

2. *THE COUNCIL OF MINISTERS*

Almost all the treatises and law books on ancient Indian law and constitution make it clear that the king constitutionally never enjoyed absolute powers. He depended for his day-to-day administration and vital governmental policies and programme on the advice and assistance of the Council of Ministers. We are told in the Mahābhārata that "the king is as vitally dependent upon ministers as animals are upon clouds, Brāhmaṇas on the Vedas and women upon their husbands."[66] The king, who would "carry on administration by himself," is called by Manu as "foolish" and "unfit."[67] Referring to the importance of the ministers he makes it clear that "even an ordinary business appears difficult if attempted by one man individually, why then make efforts to administer the government without the assistance and cooperation of the ministers."[68]

62. *Ibid., P.* 13.
63. *Watters, I, P.* 152.
64. *Ibid., I, P.* 152.
65. *Kādambarī, tr. Ridding, Pp.* 13, 74.
66. *M. Bh., V.* 37-38.
67. *MS., VII.* 30-31.
68. *Ibid., VII.* 53;

    अपि यत्सुकरं कर्म तदप्येकेन दुष्करम् ।
    विशेषतो सहा कनु राज्यं महोदयम् ॥

Kauṭilya warns that "as one wheel cannot move the chariot, the State cannot be administered without the help of others; the king can, therefore, only succeed if he acts in accordance with the wise counsel of ministers."[69] He tells that these ministers are his eyes through which he rules the State. Indra is called "thousand-eyed (Sahasrākṣa) because he had one thousand ministers."[70] Yājñavalkya also holds that the administration is possible through wise counsel.[71] Bṛahaspati advises the king that "even in righteous conduct (dharma) he should only act on the advice of wise councillors,"[72] and "should give up the smallest undertaking if there is popular clamour against it."[73] The king is ordained that he "should not decide even a law suit by himself" and that they should do it with the advice and assistance of his advisers and ministers. Such pious king alone is entitled to svarga.[74] Śukra desires that "without the Mantrins matters of State should never be considered by the king alone, be he an expert in all the sciences and versed in policy. A wise king must always follow the opinion of the members of the council of Adhikārins or ministers"...."He must never follow his own opinion." "When the sovereign becomes independent (of his council) he plans for ruin. In time he loses the State and loses the subjects."[75]

The importance of the ministers, purohits and other advisers has almost remained so throughout the ages and no king could afford to act as an autocrat. We have several evidences to prove that the king had to

---

69. *Arthaśāstra*, सहायसाध्यं राजत्वं चक्रमेकं न वर्तते।
कुर्वीत सचिवांस्तस्मात्तेषां च शृणुयान्मतम्॥
70. *Ibid.*, 1. 15.
71. *YS.*, *I.* 311.
72. *Br. Sūtra*, 1. 4-5. धर्ममपि लोकविक्रुष्टं न कुर्यात्।
करोति चेदाशास्यैनं बुद्धिमति:॥
73. *Ibid.*, *I.* 95.
74. सप्राड्विवाक: सामात्य: सब्राह्मणपुरोहित:।
ससभ्य: प्रेक्षको राजा स्वर्गं तिष्ठति धर्मत:॥
Viramitrodaya, *P.* 14, *cited in Hindu Polity*, *P.* 277, *fn.* 16.
75. *Śukranītisāra*, *II.* 2-4.

respect the advice of his ministers and wishes of the people, and when he started acting otherwise the people did not tolerate his rule and went to the extent of beheading him.

The rulers were responsible to their subjects and they had to obey the Dharma. They, therefore, never transgressed the laws of the State as prescribed in our law-books. No law-giver including Kauṭilya, one of the greatest champions of kingship and centralized administrative set-up, allows the king to act according to his sweet will.

In view of the above we can say that the age of Guptas and that of Harṣa are famous for the rule of law, state-benevolence and charity to all-needy, poor and destitute and saints, savants and teachers.

We do not possess much information in order to make a thorough study of the nature, composition, powers and functions of the Mantripariṣada during the period under review. But the sources at our disposal help us to conclude that the king had his team of advisers and ministers. The word "pariṣada" appears at several places in our sources of the period under review. It is used by king Harṣa himself in his dramas. Though the reference to it does not make it sure that it was sort of a council, but it certainly refers to "the assembly of kings." The importance attached to the amātyas and their duties may indicate that they held the office of ministers. In all the dramas the Pradhānāmātya and the amātyas appear to have close correspondence with the Chief Minister or Prime Minister and the Ministers. This can be corroborated by several authorities on political and administrative institutions. They use the word amātya in the same sense. The epigraphic evidences of the period under review also give us the same impression.[76] In the Nāgānanda great importance is attached to the Pradhānāmātya who was next to the king and Yuvarāja in the administrative set-up.[77] In the Ratnāvalī we come across several references to the chief minister and other ministers. Kāñchamālā addresses to

76. *CII., III, No.* 21, *P.* 100; *No.* 26, *P.* 120, *No.* 27, *P.* 124; *No.* 40, *P.* 190.

77. *Nāgānandam, Pp.* 10-11. *Similar importance is attached to Vasubhūti, chief minister (Pradhānāmātya) or Vikramabāhu. Ratnāvalī, Pp.* 85*ff.*

Vasantaka as amātya who is said to have "excelled amātya Yaugandharāyaṇa in planning treaty (sandhi) and war (vigraha)." It may quite safely suggest that amātya Yaugandharāyaṇa was the minister of war and peace. The incumbent of this office was teachnically called sāṁdhivigrahaka[78] or Mahāsāṁdhivigrahaka.[79] The latter title suggests that the Mahāsāṁdhivigrahaka must have held a superior office but the powers and responsibilities are almost the same. The same officer in the Allahabad pillar inscription is known as Sāṁdhivigrahaka whereas his counterpart is known as Mahāsāṁdhivigrahaka in the Khoh and Majhagawan copper plate inscriptions of Mahārāja Hastin[80] and Khoh copper plate inscription of the Mahārāja Sarvanātha.[81]

Thus our epigraphic evidences conclusively prove that both the titles are almost one and the same. We know it for certain that Hariseṇa was not only Sāmdhivigrahaka but he also occupied the positions of Kumārāmātya (councellor of the prince) and Mahādandanāyaka under Samudragupta whereas his counterparts under ordinary feudatory chiefs like Hastin and Sarvanātha enjoyed superior titles. This reflects that the tendency of assuming high-sounding titles had taken deep roots in political and administrative heirarchy. The other titles assigned to the minister of war and peace are Mahāsāṁdhivigrahādhikārādhipati[82] and Mahāsāṁ-

---

78. *It is used in this sense in the Allahabad pillar inscription of Samudragupta and other inscriptions. CII., III. No.* 1, *P.* 16, *fn.* 6; *Ibid., III, No.* 31, *P.* 139; *Ibid., III, No.* 38, *P.* 171. *These epigraphic evidences also suggest that the responsibility of drafting the royal charters was also entrusted to Sāṁdhivigrahaka. Fleet suggests that "other synonymous titles were Sāṁdhivigrahādhikṛita (Ind., Vol. VII, P.* 70, *Line* 17*f.*). *Sāṁdhivigrahādhikaraṇādhikṛita. Ibid., Ant. Vol. IV, P.* 175, *line* 18 *and Sāṁdhivigrahin. CII., III, P.* 16 *fn.* 6.

79. *Fleet opines that it was the "next grade above" that of the Sāṁdhivigrahaka. Ibid., III, P.* 16, *fn.* 6.

80. *Ibid., III, No* 22, *P.* 105. *fn.* 5. *and No.* 23, *P.* 109.

81. *Ibid., III, No.* 28, *P.* 129, *line* 29 *and No.* 30, *P.* 134, *line* 10.

82. *Ind. Ant., Vol. XI, P.* 127; *CII., III, P.* 105, *Line* 28, *also fn.* 5.

dhivigrahādhikṛita.[83] The latter was the designation of Avanti, Harṣa's supreme minister of war and peace. That he was one of the very important ministers of Harṣa's government is further proved from the fact that he was standing near Harṣa when the latter made his famous vow and "gave instructions" to him "to engrave a proclamation."[84] From Harṣa's dramas it also appears that king gave due importance to his minister of war and peace for consultation pertaining to matters of peace and war. Harṣa's hero in the drama is reported to have asked Vidūṣaka to summon amātya Rumaṇvant.[85] The latter, in his capacity as amātya, appears to have enjoyed higher status than the General. We gather this impression from the ettiquate observed at the court. When Rumaṇvant, the amātya, entered the palace along with general Vijayasena, the king asked the amātya to take the seat whereas Vijayasena remained standing. When the minister introduced the general, the latter offered a salute to the king and then he was offered the seat.[86] Bāṇa offers another example which proves that the status of the Prime Minister was supreme and he ranked after the king. He was a much-respected figure in the court and his opinion and advice were respectfully heard and were acted upon. This we gather from the place Śukanāsa enjoyed at Tārāpīḍa's court. On the eve of consecration ceremony of Prince Chandrapīḍa the prime minister Śukanāsa is said to have delivered a lecture to the prince. This discourse is a fine piece of advice to a crown-prince which he gave in order to acquaint him with the task ahead and the duties and responsibilities he was destined to fulfil as a ruler.[87] This discourse also included a warning against several evils and dangers likely to creep into if proper care was not taken. This importance Śukanāsa enjoyed was largely due to his success as a great statesman and administrator.

---

83. *HCK.*, *Canto* 6, *P.* 47.

84. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 187; *HCK.*, *Canto* 6, *P.* 47.

85. *He figures as a minister in the Priyadarśikā whereas in the Ratnāvali he occupies the position of a general.*

86. *Priyadarśikā*, *Pp.* 12-13.

87. *Kādambari*, *tr. Ridding*, *Pp.* 76-84. *cf. Arthaśāstra*, *Pp.* 36-41.

He is said to be well-versed in the affairs of the kingdom and art of the government. This was due to his thorough knowledge of Śrutis, Smṛitis and Dharmaśāstras. His knowledge of the political institutions and ideals was wide and his understanding was deep and statesman-like.[88]

Similar respectful regards were shown to other senior ministers and officers of the State. We learn from the Harṣacharita that Senāpati Siṁhanāda was very much respected by the emperor himself,[89] and his advice was respectfully listened to and was acted upon.

These literary evidences are also corroborated by the Chinese pilgrim. Yuan Chwang informs us that after the treacherous murder of Rājyavardhana "the statesmen of Kanauj, on the advice of their leading man Bāni (or Vāni),[90] invited Harṣavardhana "to become their sovereign."[91] He spoke to the ministers who had assembled to decide the succession issue: 'The destiny of the nation is to be fixed today. The old king's son is dead; the brother of the prince, however, is humane and affectionate, and his disposition, heaven-conferred, is dutiful and obedient. Because he is

---

88. *Kādambarī, tr. Ridding, Pp.* 48-49.

89. *HCCTH., Pp.* 180*ff.*

90. *Some scholars identify Bāni with Harṣa's cousin Bhaṇḍi. JRAS.,* 1903, *P.* 560, *Harṣa, P.* 17, *fn.* 1. *Dr. Tripathi, however, does not agree to this identification. THK., P.* 75. *We may have genuine difference over the problem of identification but what the pilgrim says about political and administrative set-up is of great significance.*

91. *Watters, I, P.* 343; *Beal, I, P.* 211. *On this basis, Dr. R. C. Majumdar appears correct when he says that Harṣa owed his throne to his people (or more correctly, to his ministers). R. C. Majumdar, Corporate Life in Ancient India, P.* 112. *Dr. Altekar, however, does not agree to this conclusion. Dr. A. S. Altekar, State and Government in Ancient India, P.* 78. *His analysis appears better when he concludes that "after the death of Grahvarman, there was no competent heir left for the Maukharī throne. The Maukharī ministers, therefore, decided to offer the crown to the brother of their widowed queen. The instance shows that when there was a failure of heirs, the ministers and other high dignitaries used to elect a suitable successor from among the relations of the deceased king." Ibid., P.* 78, *fn.* 5.

strongly attached to his family, the people will trust (in) him. I propose that he assume the royal authority : let each one give his opinion on this matter, whatever he thinks. We are further told that "they were all agreed on this point, and acknowledged his conspicuous qualities. On this the chief ministers and the magistrates approached Harṣa and entreated him to assume the royal authority."[92] These proceedings and deliberations throw enough light on the powers and functions of the prime minister and other ministers of his council. Thus, they appear to have enjoyed great power and had the supreme choice in determining the succession issue.[93] The statement further proves that every minister was allowed to express his opinion freely, frankly and fearlessly and the decisions were generally taken unanimously.

3. *THE ADMINISTRATIVE DIVISIONS*

We have several technical territorial terms which cannot exactly and uniformly be determined and made applicable to all periods and to the entire country, generally known as deśa,[94] rājya[95] and rāṣṭra. For the

---

92. *Beal. I, P.* 211.

93. *Even in the ordinary course the king consulted his council in nominating his successor and when he acted otherwise, the council, and even the ordinary citizens could object to it and could ask for an explanation. When Śantanu and Puru were nominated the successors by Pratīpa and Yayāti respectively in supercession to the claims of their elder brothers, the people are said to have assembled in front of the royal palace and asked for an explanation. They returned only after satisfactory explanations were offered. Even the nomination of Rāma was formally approved by the neighbouring kings, feudatories and citizens.*

94. *The stage-manager in all the dramas of Harṣa introduces to the audience the circle of kings coming from different countries and regions (nānādigdeśāt).*

95. *In the dramas Harṣa also uses rājya as a territorial term for a country. Ratnāvalī*, 1. 9; *Nāgānanda*, 1.7. *In the Priyadarśikā it is substituted by "Paura." Priyadarśikā*, 1.7. *Bāṇa uses the word, very clearly in the sense of a country. He terms "Pārasīkadeśa" for the country of Persia. His terms 'Janapada' and 'Janapadaviśeṣa' used for Śrīkaṇṭha and Sthāṇvīśvara respectively, may*

administrative purposes the country was divided into the bhuktis, viṣayas, paṭhaks and grāmas. While the country was directly governed by the emperor and his council of ministers, the bhuktis were placed under the charge of provincial governors who were directly responsible to the emperor. That Harṣa's empire was divided into several bhuktis, is proved by his own inscriptions. Ahichchhatrā and Śrāvastī were two of the several bhuktis of Harṣa's empire.

The bhukti was further divided into the viṣayas. Dr. Tripathi appears to have rightly observed that the viṣaya may correspond to a district,"[96] and it was placed under the administrative control of viṣayapati.[97]

The next and the smallest territorial unit was the village. In Indian administrative set-up the village has worked as an autonomous unit and the governments, throughout the ages, allowed it to settle its own affairs. The State control was confined to revenue and taxation and other allied matters. But in day-to-day life the village councils had their own functions and responsibilities. Sāñchī stone inscription of the times of Chandragupta II refers to a Pañcha-maṇḍalī.[98] This is the same as the village Pañchāyat. It is not necessary, as Fleet has observed, that the maṇḍalī should have five members. The sovereign nature and character of the maṇḍalī is clear from the fact that Āmrakārdava is referred to in the grant as "having prostrated himself in the pañchmaṇḍalī" (pañcha-maṇḍalyāṁ praṇipatya). The man in village directly responsible to government was the village chief, generally known as grāmika. Reference

---

suggest that the country as a whole was known as Deśa and a particular region was known as Janapada and the headquarters of the Janapada was probably known as Janapadaviśeṣa. Fleet has drawn our attention to the fact that "deśa is sometimes used as a synonym of maṇḍala and other territorial terms. CII., P. 32, fn. 7. But this does not apply to the period under review in northern India at least.

96. *THK., P. 143; CII., III, P. 32, fn. 7, also Pp. 52ff.*

97. *This official title is referred to not only in Harṣa's inscriptions but also in several other inscriptions of the period under review. CII., III, P. 32, fn. 7, also No.* 16, *P.* 69, *fn.* 4.

98. *CII., III, P. 32, also fn.* 5.

to grāmika in the Bhumra stone pillar inscription of the Mahārājas Hastin and Sarvanātha further corroborate our conclusion.[99]

Other officers, who are referred to in the works of Bāṇa and other literary works and epigraphic records, had also their place in bureaucratic heirarchy and we propose to refer to them separately. These officers included the Mahāsāmantas (feudatory chiefs with some amount of autonomy),[100] Sāmantas[101] with titles of Mahārājas, Daussādhasādhanikas (porters or superintendents of villages),[102] Dūtas (envoys and ambassadors),[103] Rājasthānīyas (officers in charge of king's abode or foreign service chiefs or viceroys),[104] Kumārāmātyas,[105] Uparika (provincial governors in charge of bhuktis),[106] Mahattaras (village chiefs),[107] Bhogikas (revenue collectors).[108] Grāmakṣapaṭalika or akṣapaṭalika or mahattaras were the village officers. Pustakakṛitas[109] were perhaps the same as pustālas as referred to in the

99. *Ibid., III, No.* 24, *Pp.* 111-112, *also fn.* 2.

100 *They were responsible for the proper functioning of their principalities and were responsible to the emperor for maintaining law and order and genearl supervision and control. CII., III, Pp.* 41*ff.*

101. *Ibid., III, Pp.* 41*ff.*

102. *Ep. Ind., Vol. XII, Pp.* 43, 141.

103. *HCCTH., Pp.* 211*ff.*

104. *CII., III, P.* 157, *fn.* 1; *Ind. Ant., Vol. V, P.* 207. *Bom. Gaz., I, Part* 1, *P.* 80.

105. *This title is frequently referred to in the Gupta inscriptions and those of Harṣa. According to Fleet, it means "consellor of the prince." CII., III, No.* 1, *P.* 16, *fn.* 7. *It is also suggested by Dr. Bloch that it may correspond to "an officer in the service of the king from the time when he was a boy." Ep. Ind., Vol. X, P.* 50. *Most probably, they were the state dignitaries with the rank of amātyas and were recruited from amongst the princes.*

106. *They appear to have been entitled to assume the titles of mahārājas.*

107. *Ep. Ind., Vol. XV, P.* 136, *They are, probably, also known as grāmikas.*

108. *THK., P.* 140.

109. *HCCTH., P.* 33. *Cowell and Thomas refer to him as a scribe, Ibid., P.* 33, *fn.* 2.

Dāmodarapur copper plates. Basaka tells us that they "were made aware of the title to all lands."[110] Mahāpratihāras and mahāpratihārīs were the chief door-keepers at the royal palaces and camps. As the terms suggest both males and femals were recruited to these posts. Below them were the pratihāras and pratihārīs. Similar were the assignments of Dīrghādhvaga ("express couriers"),[111] Lekhahāraka (letter-carrier"),[112] overseers[113] (sarvagatās).[114] Bāṇa also throws some light on the arrangement Harṣa made for night patrolling by regular police. The police force recruited for night patrolling also consisted of the females. We are told in the Harṣacharita that "loving pairs were aroused from sleep by the tramp of the women of the watch."[115]

DEPARTMENTAL HEADS

Bāṇa also refers to adhyakṣas who were probably the departmental heads and they must have been directly responsible for their respective departments. Dr. Tripathi, however, opines that they were "the subordinate officials" and were "under their departmental superintendents."[116]

There are several other official titles in the inscriptions of the period under review. But, as we have already referred to it in the beginning, we have no basis to accept them on uniform basis. Sometimes we do not find complete uniformity in one and the same kingdom also. The main reason is that the bureaucratic machinery was not so complex as it is today, and secondly, there were no written constitutions and codes. The State and Government were governed in accordance with the laws and rules as laid down in the śrutis, smṛitis, dharmaśāstras and several

---

110. *Ep. Ind.*, *XV*, *P.* 128.

111. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 145; *Beal*, *I*, *P.* 215; *THK.*, *P.* 141.

112. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 223.

113. *They were appointed "to take charge of the booty."* *Ibid.*, *P.* 225.

114. *They were "officers of the secret service."* *THK.*, *P.* 141.

115. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 199. "यामचेटीचरणचलनोत्थाप्यमानका मिमिथुने।"
—हृ० च०, स० उ०, पृ० ५४, *also THK.*, *P.* 137; *HCCTH.*, *P.* 199, *fn.* 4.

116. *THK.*, *P.* 143.

other works on polity. The king governed the State as an upholder of dharma and it was his religious and moral duty to make his people happy and to encourage them to righteous conduct. The entire administrative set-up was aimed at the fulfilment of this goal.

4. *JUDICIAL ADMINISTRATION*

We have also some glimpses of judicial system. Yuan Chwang informs us that "as the government is honestly administered and the people live together on good terms, the criminal class is small. The Statute law is sometimes violated and plots made against the sovereign; when the crime is brought to the light the offender is imprisoned for life; he does not suffer any corporal punishment, but alive and dead he is not treated as a member of the community. For offences against social morality and disloyal and unfilial conduct, the punishment is to cut off the nose or an ear or a hand or a foot or to banish the offender to another country or into the wilderness. Other offences can be atoned for by a money payment."[117] Harsa is said to have "prohibited the taking of life under severe penalities."[118] Literary and epigraphic evidences also throw some light on the judicial machinery. Pramātri is said to be an officer "entrusted with justice.[119] He is also said to be "a spiritual councillor."[120] Other officers who dealt with offenders and acted as judges were known as mīmāṁsakas.[121]

JAILS

The State also maintained jails to lodge the offenders and criminals. Sometimes they were also handcuffed.[122] Bāṇa informs us that general amnesty was also granted to prisoners on festive occasions. On the birthday

---

117. *Watters, I, Pp.* 171-172.

118. *Ibid., I, P.* 343.

119. *THK., P.* 140.

120. *Ep. Ind., I, P.* 118.

121. *THK., P.* 141; *Ep. Ind., XIV, P.* 325.

122. *Ratnāvalī,* 3.19, *P.* 121, *also Pp.* 124*ff. Many interesting details are known about the jails in the Priyadarśikā.*

of Harṣa,[123] and later on, at the time of coronation day when the emperor was marching for digvijaya, the prisoners are said to have been set free.[124]

Referring to the procedure of determining innocence or guilt of an offender, Yuan Chwang tells us about the four ordeals. "These four ordeals," were "by water, by fire, by weighing, and by poison."

Firstly, according to the pilgrim, "in the water ordeal the accused was put in one sack and a stone in another, then the two sacks were connected and were thrown into a deep stream; if the sack containing the stone floated, and the other sank, the man's guilt was proved." Secondly, "the fire ordeal required the accused to kneel and tread on hot iron, to take it in his hand and lick it; if he was innocent, he was not hurt; but he was burnt if he was proved guilty." Thirdly, "in the weighing ordeal the accused was weighed against a particular stone, and if the latter was lighter the charge was false." Fourthly, "the poision ordeal required that the right hind leg of a ram was cut off, and according to the portion assigned to the accused to eat; poisons were put into the leg, and if the man was innocent he survived and if not the pioson took effect".[125] This account of the pilgrim finds no corroboration to it. Neither in the contemporary literary works nor in the inscriptions we find even a trace of any of these four ordeals. Watters has rightly observed that Yuan Chwang's "account of these trials by ordeal in India differs both as to the actual ordeals, and the mode of procedure with them, from the descriptions to be found in other works."[126] But these are also mentioned by Alberuni.[127]

5. *REVENUE AND FINANCE*

Harṣa's liberal patronage to art and culture and his generous distribution of wealth at quinquennial assemblies held at Prayāga amply prove that Harṣa followed a sound fiscal policy. This does not mean that

---

123. *HCCTH., P.* 111.
124. *Ibid., P.* 198.
125. *Watters, I, P.* 172.
126. *Ibid, P.* 172.
127. *Alberuni, II, P.* 159.

he accumulated wealth by heavy taxation. This was largely due to his enlightened government. The Chinese pilgrim informs us that "the official requirements" were not many because of the enlightened character of his government. We are told that "of royal land there is a four-fold division; one part was for the expenses of the Government and state-worship, one for the endowment of great public servants, one to reward high intellectual eminence and one for acquiring religious merit by gifts to the various sects."[128] Referring to the financial resources the pilgrim informs that "the taxation being light and forced service being sparingly used, every one kept his hereditary occupation and attended to his patrimony."[129]

Of the several sources of revenue the main item was the share of produce. We are informed that "the king's tenants paid one-sixth of the produce as rent."[130] This share is the same as prescribed by ancient Indian Law-givers.[131] Other taxes were paid by tradesmen who went "to and fro bartering their merchandize after paying light duties at ferries and barrier stations."[132]

These accounts of the Chinese pilgrim are further supplemented by the inscriptions of the period under review. They enlist several sources of the State revenue levied during the period. They are tulya, meya, bhāga, bhoga kara, uparikara, udraṅga, bhūta, hiraṇya or suvarṇa, ādeya and various types of fines imposed on offenders.

6. *MILITARY ADMINISTRATION*

All sources at our disposal prove that the king was the supreme head of the army and as such he always took personal interest in maintaining the army.

Referring to the composition of the army the Chinese pilgrim tells us, "The army is composed of Foot, Horse, Chariot, and Elephant

---

128. *Watters, I, P.* 176.
129. *Ibid., I, P.* 176.
130. *Ibid., I, P.* 176.
131. *MS., VII.* 130-31, *VIII.* 308; *Smṛtiratnākar, P.* 62.
132. *Watters, I, P.* 176.

Soldiers. The war-elephant is covered with coat-of-mail, and his tusks are provided with sharp barbs. On him rides the commander-in-chief, who has a soldier on each side to manage the elephant. The chariot in which an officer sits is drawn by four horses whilst infantry guard it on both sides. The infantry go lightly into action and are choice men of valour; they bear a large shield and carry a long spear; some are armed with a sword or sabre and dash to the front of the advancing line of battle. They are perfect experts with all the implements of war such as spear, shield, bow and arrow, sword, sabre etc. having been drilled in them for generations."[133]

Thus it appears clearly from his descriptions that he talks of four traditional limbs (chaturāṅgabala) of the army and was not speaking of the actual composition of the army under Harṣa. Harṣa himself refers to three limbs of the army in his dramas. They are "the irresistible forces of many elephants, horses and foot soldiers" (anekagajaturagapadātidurviṣahabala).[134] While describing actual military forces of Harṣa and other rulers the pilgrim also refers to the three limbs. Referring to Harṣa's army he tells us that soon after Harṣa became the king "he increased his army, bringing the elephant corps up to 60,000 and the cavalry to 100,000."[135] The number of the foot soldiers must have been much larger. Coming to the description of Mahārāṣṭra (Mo-ha-la-ch'a) under Pulakeśin II, the pilgrim informs of the "martial heroes who led the van of the army in battle" and "their war-elephants" are also highly appreciated. We are further told, "Relying on the strength of his herose and elephants the king treated neighbouring countires with contempt."[136] Thus the two great rulers of the period under review had three-fold forces. None of them

133. *Watters, I, P.* 171. *That Harṣa gave top priority to military matters is further proved by the fact that while he "gave away in religious alms everything," "material of war" was excluded from these alms. Ibid., I, P.* 344.

134. *Priyadarśikā, Pp.* 74-5; *also IV.* 5; *Ratnāvalī, Act. IV, P.* 136. *Like 'śaktitrayaṁ, these three limbs of the army were known as "balamtriyaṁ."*

135. *Watters, I,* 343; *Beal, I.* 213.

136. *Ibid., II, P.* 239.

had the chariots. Bāṇa also refers to "troops of camels" at the royal camp of Harṣa.[137]

In addition to these corps we are also told of "the National Guard." It consisted of "the heroes of choice valour, and, as the profession was hereditary, they became adepts in military tactics. In peace they guarded the sovereign's residence and in war they became the intrepid vanguard."[138]

THE SENĀPATI

We have already seen that the king was the Supreme Commander of all armed forces but for day-to-day military administration he appointed an army chief known as the Senāpati. The latter enjoyed great respect at the royal court and only a man of great military vision and one who was well-versed in the art of war and other allied matters was appointed on this high military office in the State. Bāṇa refers to Senāpati Siṁhanāda who appears to have occupied a very high place at the royal court. He was the Senāpati under Harṣa's father Prabhākaravardhana, and the latter treated him as a friend.[139] The Senāpati was not only the head of the armed forces but he led the forces in active military operations. Siṁhanāda had been "a man foremost in every fight" (Samagravigrahaprāgraharo), with "his broad chest" which was "rough with great gashes of wounds" (vivṛitavadandirbṛihadbhirvraṇavidarairviṣamitaviśālavakṣaḥ) and "all across it ran in lines the writings of many great scars graven by the axe edge of sharp swords" (niśitaśastraṭaṅkakoṭikuṭṭitabahubṛihadvaraṇākṣarapaṅktinirantaratayā). He was "the family priest of martial companies," "the performer of proud speeches," "the sustainer of the routed," "the executor of pledges," "the authority on openings in

---

137. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 46; *cf. Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra*, *P.* 167.

138. *Watters*, *I*, 171.

139. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 180; *HCK.*, *Canto* 6, *P.* 44. *It appears that the general was the army chief under Prabhākaravardhana and the latter treated him as his friend. His status as a retired general proves that great respect was shown to ex-army officers.*

great wars" and "his very voice inspired the warriors with lust for battle."[140]

This description is corroborated by other evidences. In Harṣa's Priyadarśikā General Vijayasena is said to have "led the army of Udayana to invade the Kaliṅgas." The king, satisfied at his general's ability and achievements, says to his anxious queen :

"Led by Vijayasena, our armies invaded the frontier region
And destroyed the glory of the accursed Kaliṅga,
Who suddenly withdrew to his fortress
And, with a rampart as his sole defense, has been made defenseless."
"And, he being in such a plight,
Crippled by the invasion described, and the activity of his slavish warriors decreasing day by day,
With ruin impending, with his elephants, horses and men being destroyed, and his entire army depleted,
When his fortress there shall have been breached on all sides in a twinkling, today or tomorrow, by my forces,
You will hear before long, my Lady, that Kaliṅga has been captured or slain in battle."[141]

Similar is the description of the military expedition led by General Rumṇavant against Kaliṅga.[142] These graphic descriptions prove that the generals led the armies and the king was personally interested in their military achievements. In major wars the king himself practicipated. The epigraphic evidences also give the same impression.[143] It is not

---

140. *HCCTH.*, 180-2; *HCK.*, *Canto* 6, *Pp.* 44-5.

141. *Priyadarśikā, IV.* 4-5, *Pp.* 78-79.

142. *Ratnāvalī, Pp.* 9-10. *These two examples also prove that the elephants, horses and foot soldiers formed the three-fold army.*

143. *CII., III, No.* 38, *P.* 167, *fn.* 10. *I find it difficult to agree with Fleet that "the next grade above this was Mahāsenāpati." The learned scholar has drawn our attention to this title in the Bijayagadh inscription of the Yaudheyas. Ibid., III;, No.* 58, *Pp.* 251-2. *Firstly the inscription is not dated and it appears, that the inscription in question must have belonged to quite early period of Indian history.*

understood as to why Bāṇa does not refer to Harṣa's Senāpati whereas he tells so much about Senāpati Siṁhanāda. It is quite likely that the latter must have been allowed to continue on his post. As he was quite old he could not actively participate in military operations but the emperor could have the benefit of his matured ideas and past military experiences. The duties of the Senāpati appear to have been performed by "the supreme minister of war and peace (Mahāsaṁdhivigrahādhikṛita).

MAHĀBALĀDHIKṚITA

Under the Senāpati or the Commander-in-Chief were several military commanders. Next to the Senāpati was the army commander (Mahābalādhikṛita).[145] He must have been in-charge of a particular corp.[146]

BALĀDHIKṚITA[147]

He must have been a commander under Mahābalādhikṛita. Bāṇa gives us an impression that he was chief of the Barrack Superintendents[148] (pāṭīpati). This title is also used in similar sense in the Shahpur stone image inscription of Ādityasena, dated in 66th year of the Harṣa era (c. 672-3 A.D.).[149]

We have references to several other military officers of other divisions.

Secondly, the title is attributed to the leader of the Yaudheyas. It is, therefore, quite probable that the title was assumed by king or the head of the State himself. This title was assigned to him for his role as the supreme commander of the armed forces.

145. *The title was also known Mahābalādhyakṣa. CII., III, App. IV, P.* 179. *This military title is referred to in an inscription of Aṁśuvarman, dated in the year* 34 *of the Harṣa Saṁvat. Ibid., P.* 179.

146. *Fleet also opines that he was "a great officer placed at the head of the forces." CII., III, No.* 23. *P.* 109, *fn.* 2.

147. *Like Mahābalādhyakṣa he must have also been known as Balādhyakṣa.*

148. *HCCTH., P.* 199; *HCK., Canto* 7, *P.* 54.

149. *CII., III, No.* 43, *P.* 210, *fn.* 2. *Literally it means "one who is appointed to (a command of) the troops."*

BṚIHADAŚVAVĀRA

He is introduced to us as "a chief officer of the cavalry."[150] It apears that he was also known as "aśvapati"[151] or aśvapāla.[152] We are told by Bāṇa that Harṣa had in his royal stable the horses from Vanāyu, Āraṭṭa, Kamboja, Bharadvāja, Sindh and Persia.

GAJASĀDHANĀDHIKṚITA

He was "the Commandant of the whole elephant troops."[153] Like that of the horses Harṣa's elephant stable was also full of several types of elephants. Some of them were "newly bound, others acquired as tributes or as presents, some sent by the rangers of the elephant's district's (*Nāga-vithīpālas*).[154] As the elephants were the most vital to the army Harṣa appears to have taken special care of the elephant corp. Bāṇa refers to "the chief elephant doctors" who were placed in charge of elephants and were required to report about their elephants at a very short notice.

BHAṬA-CHĀTA

Most probably they were "regular and irregular soldiers."[155] Bāṇa also refers to "groups of elephant men, bachelors, knaves, donkey boys, camp followers, thieves, serving men, rogues and grooms"[156] who were present at Harṣa's camp when he was marching against the Gauḍa king Śaśāṅka. They must have been employed in the army temporarily to assist the regular army. It is quite likely that these persons and the regular soldiers might have been known as Bhaṭa-Chāta.

---

150. *HCCTH., P. 177; HCK., P. 43. Kuntala was Harṣa's cavalry chief.*

151. *CII., III, No.* 61, *P.* 260, *fn.* 2.

152. *Ratnāvalī, II.* 2, *P.* 44.

153. *HCCTH., P.* 189; *HCK., Canto* 6, *P.* 49. *Like Aśvapāla and Aśvapati, there must have also been the titles of Gajapati and Gajapāla.*

154. *HCCTH., P.* 46.

155. *They are referred to in several inscriptions including those of Harṣa. CII., III, P.* 98. *fn.* 2.

156. *HCCTH., P.* 207.

CHAPTER VIII

HARṢA AS AN AUTHOR AND PATRON OF AUTHORS

SECTION A.

AUTHENTICITY OF HARṢA'S AUTHORSHIP

Besides the profoundly fascinating panorma of events, the history of India provides us with a number of examples of rulers whose claim to rememberance rests not only on their conquests and political achievements, but, rather more, on their contribution and patronage they liberally extended to the domain of literature, art and culture. Many monarchs of ancient India[1] wielded pen as well as the sceptre and the sword, with equal distinction and success. While the sword shattered the pride of enemies, the pen disseminated the message of love, peace and fraternity. Among such monarchs Harṣa's claims as an author and patron of authors have been universally accepted.[2]

India's history, traditions, legends and literature contain references to six Harṣas, including Śri Harṣavardhana of Kānyakubja, who ruled over Northern India from 606 to 647 A.D., and who has been accredited with the authorship of the three Sanskrit dramas.[3]

---

1. *Paper of the present author on 'Kings As Authors in Ancient India', contributed to the Twenty-Second Session of the Indian History Congress, Gauhati,* 1959, *Proceedings of the Gauhati Session of the Indian History Congress, Pp.* 179-180.

2. *THK., Pp.* 175-187; *Dr. Radha Kumud Mookerji, Harṣa, Pp.* 152-9; *JBHU., Vol. I, No.* 2, 1937, *Pp.* 231-242; *Pannikar, Śrī Harṣa of Kanauj, P.* 65; *Gauri Shankar Chattopadhyaya, Harṣavardhana, Pp.* 231-247.

3. *Dr. S. N. Dasgupta and Dr. S. K. De, A History of Sanskrit Literature, Vol. I, P.* 255. *The dramas assigned to Harṣa are the Priyadarśikā, the Ratnāvalī and the Nāgānandam.*

The first among these Harṣas is the author of the Kāvyapradīpa. The second is Śrī Harṣa, the author of the Naiṣadhīyacharita, the Khaṇḍanakhaṇḍakhādya and other seven great works. The third is the tyrannical king of Kashmīr, who, according to the Rājataraṅgiṇī ruled from c. 1090 A.D. to c. 1101 A.D.[4] It is said that Somadeva wrote the Kathāsaritasāgara to win and seduce the beautiful queen of this tyrant ruler of Kashmīr.[5] The fourth is the father of Muñja and the grand-father of King Bhoja of the Parmāra dynasty of Dhāra. And the fifth was Harṣa-Vikramāditya of Ujjayani.[6] At his court Mātṛigupta received patronage.[7] This king is also identified with Yaśodharman of Mālvā.[8]

The first two of these were not kings and, therefore, they do not concern us with regard to the problem of the authorship of the three plays, the Ratnāvalī, the Priyadarśikā and the Nāgānandaṁ. Among the remaining Harṣas, who were the king-poets and authors, the grand-father of Bhoja lived in the tenth century A.D. and the tyrannical King of Kashmīr ruled in the closing decade of the eleventh century A.D. and his reign came to an end in 1101, A.D.. Thus these two kings also can be set aside from our discussion on the simple ground of chronological posteriority.[9] Now there remains the king Harṣa-Vikramāditya of

---

4. *Sir Aurel Stein, Kalhaṇa's Rājataraṅgiṇī, London*, 1900, *Book VII*, *P.* 333*f; K. M. Pannikar, Śrī Harṣa of Kanauj, P.* 65; *Nāgānandaṁ, Ed. and tr. Sadhuram, P. IX; THK., P.* 180.

5. *Cited in introduction to Nāgānandaṁ, ed. Karamarkar, Poona, 3rd. Ed., P. IX.*

6. *Stein, Rājataraṅginī, Book III*; *The., P.* 180.

7. *Pannikar, Śrī Harṣa of Kanauj, P.* 65; *Stein, Rājataraṅgiṇī, P.* 83.

8. *JRAS.*, 1909, *P.* 446; *THK., P.* 180.

9. *Dāmodaragupta, who lived under Jayapīḍa of Kashmīr* (779-810 *A.D.*), *refers in his book 'Kuṭṭanīmataṁ, the story and enactment of Ratnāvalī which he regarded as a work composed by a king. It must, however, be noted that the author of 'Kuṭṭanīmataṁ' does not give the name of that king who composed Ratnāvalī. The celebrated poet Māgha, who lived in the 8th century A. D., also*

Ujjayinī. The Rājataraṅgiṇī does not give any account of his learning and literary achievements. Kalhaṇa only speaks that Mātṛigupta lived at his court.[10] Late Dr. R. S. Tripathi rightly observed that his title alone decides the controversy.[11] The learned scholar has pointed out that Harṣa was only his secondary name and Vikramāditya was his title and it is "improbable that if this Harṣa had been the author of these plays, he would have omitted to mention the prized title of 'Vikramāditya' in the Prastāvanā." It has been again observed that Harṣa-Vikramāditya was not a Buddhist and so he could not be assigned the authorship of "an almost Buddhist play as the Nāgānandaṁ."[12] Thus Harṣavardhana of Kānyakubja alone is left to enjoy the credit of the authoriship of these three plays. Apart from these negative arguments we have other innumerable positive evidences which help us to prove conclusively that Harṣa was a man of letters and that he was the author of the three dramas.[13]

In order to come to a definite conclusion we have to re-examine and revaluate these proofs in light of recent researches and to justify the claims of Harṣa as an author of great repute who wrote the Priyadarśikā, the Ratnāvalī and the Nāgānandaṁ.

TESTIMONY OF BĀṆA

Bāṇa, the famous court-poet of Harṣa, acknowledges the poetic genius and the literary craftmanship of his master on more than one occasion in the Harṣacharita. In the very beginning of the first chapter of this

---

refers to Nāgānandaṁ in his Kāvya. Keith, Classical Sanskrit Literature, Pp. 54-55.

10. *Stein, Rājataraṅgiṇī, P.* 83.

11. *THK., Pp.* 180-81.

12. *Ibid., P.* 181.

13. *Ibid., P.* 181. *The authorship of these plays has now been conclusively determined by the authors of an authentic work on the history of Sanskrit literature. Dr. S. N. Dasgupta and Dr. S. K. De, A History of Sanskrit Literature, Vol. I, P.* 255.

Kāvya he relates a long line of poets and their respective creations. We are told that the power of Āḍhyarāja's utsāha was very great. Bāṇa further says that his tongue seemed checked and drawn within his mouth by Āḍhyarāja's utsāha.[14]

Ettinghausen and Pischel[15] have identified Āḍhyarāja with Harṣa. Āḍhyarāja here in this verse is portrayed for Harsa alone as it is quite clear from the concluding verse where Bāṇa makes a direct reference to Harṣa.[16] Later, in the long and decorated list of his account of Harṣa's achievements Bāṇa gives a definite evidence of his poetic skill. He says that Harṣa's "masterful gift in poetry could hardly find expression in words just as his valour lacked sufficient range of its existence."[17] At another place Bāṇa describes that he (Harsa) "in poetical contest poured out a nectar of his own which he had not received from any foreign source."[18] Nevertheless, Bāṇa's account must be accepted only with some reservation as it was a prevalent tendency among the court-poets and authors to praise their patrons attributing all sorts of superhuman and meritorious achievements to them.

OTHER HISTORICAL EVIDENCES

We are really puzzled when we find that Yuan Chuang, who

---

14. आढ्यराजकृतोत्साहैर्हृदयस्थैः स्मृतैरपि ॥
जिह्वान्तः कृष्यमाणेव न कवित्वे प्रवर्तते ॥१८॥
तथापि नृपतेर्भक्त्याभीतो निर्वहणाकुलः ।
करोम्याख्यायिकाम्भोधौ जिह्वाप्लवनचापलम् ॥१९॥ —ह० च०, प्र० उ०, पृ० २।

15. *Maurice. L. Ettinghausen, Harṣavardhana, P.* 98; *R. Pischel, Āḍhyarāja, Pp.* 485-487.

16. जयति ज्वलत्प्रतापज्वलनप्राकारकृतजगद्रक्षः ।
सकलप्रणयिमनोरथसिद्धिश्रीपर्वतो हर्षः ॥२१॥ —ह० च०, प्र० उच्छ०, पृ० २।

17. *HCCTH., P.* 65. अपि चास्य त्यागस्यार्थिनः, प्रज्ञायाः शास्त्राणि, कवित्वस्य वाचः, सत्त्वस्य साहसस्थानानि, उत्साहस्य व्यापाराः, कीर्तेर्दिङ्मुखानि, अनुरागस्य लोकहृदयानि, गुणगणस्य सङ्ख्या, कौशलस्य कलाः, न पर्याप्तो विषयः। —ह० च०, द्वि० उच्छ०, पृ० ३५।

18. *HCCTH., P.* 58; काव्यकथास्वपीतमप्यमृतमुद्वमन्तम् ।
—ह० च०, द्वि० उच्छ०, पृ० ३२।

received warm welcome at Harṣa's court and lived there for a pretty long time, is completely silent about Harṣa's literary craftmanship. But I-Tsing, another Chinese itinerant scholar, who visited this country after the death of Harṣa, authoritatively writes that the king Śīlāditya was exceedingly fond of literature and he himself composed the story of the Bodhisattva Jīmūtavāhana, who sacrificed his own life to save that of a serpent. This version was "performed by a band accompanied by dancing and acting," and thus it became very popular during his age.[19]

Records of I-Tsing are generally accepted by many scholars as the "most important and reliable testimony."[20]

LITERARY EVIDENCE

Soḍḍhala, who flourished in the eleventh century A.D., places Harsa's name among the kings, like Vikramāditya, Muñja, Bhoja and others who were poets and patrons of men of letters.[21] In another passage Soḍḍhala refers to Harsa as the illustrious king by whom Bāṇa was honoured with the highest esteem and abundant wealth (a hundred crores of gold).[22] Jayadeva, who lived in the twelfth century A.D.,[23] ranks Harṣa with Bhāsa, Kālidāsa, Bāṇa, Mayūra and Chora in a stanza of his work Pra-

---

19. *I-Tsing, A Record of Buddhist Religion in India and Malay Archipelago, Tr. by Takakusu, Oxford*, 1896, *Pp*. 163-64.

20. *THK., P.* 184.

21. कवीन्द्रैश्च विक्रमादित्यश्रीहर्षमुञ्जभोजदेवादिभूपालैः।
Soḍḍhala's Udayasundarikathā, Ed. by C. D. Dalal and Krishnamacharya, Baroda, 1920, *P.* 150.

22. श्रीहर्ष इत्यवनिवर्तिषु पार्थिवेषु
नाम्नैव केवलमजायत वस्तुतस्तु,
गीर्हर्ष एष निजसंसदि येन राजा
सम्पूजितः कनककोटिशतेन बाणः,

23. *THK., P.* 183.

sannarāghava.[24] The famous seventeenth-century philosopher Madhusūdana writes in his Bhāvabodhinī that "two eastern poets, called Bāṇa and Mayūra lived at the court of Mahārāja Śrī-Harṣa, the chief of poets, the composer of the Nāṭikā called the Ratnāvalī and who was the lord of Mālvā and whose capital was Ujjain."[25] The association of Harṣa with Mālvā and Ujjain is undoubtedly wrong but "the contemporaneity and literary gifts of Bāṇa, Mayūra and Harṣa seem to be the substratum of truth in this erroneous statement."[26]

We must conclude our account of literary evidences with the reference found in Subhāṣitaratnabhāṇḍāgāra. This elaborate anthology of Sanskrit verses contains a stanza which includes the name of Śrī Harṣa in a galaxy of distinguished poets, dramatists and writers, who "pleased the world by the composition of their masterpieces."[27] The writers enumerated therein are Māgha, Chora, Mayūra, Murāri, Bhāravi, Harsa, Kālidāsa, Bhavabhūti, Bhojarāja, Daṇḍin, Bhallaṭa Bāṇabhaṭṭa and Subandhu.

Dhanañjaya, the court-poet of Muñja, in his Daśarūpa, refers to the dramas of Harsa, the Priyadarśikā, the Ratnāvalī and the Nāgānandaṁ.[28] The Nāgānandam and the Ratnāvalī are also referred to in Dhvanyāloka

---

24. यम्याश्चोरश्चिकुरनिकर· कर्णपूरो मयूरो भासो हास: कविकुलगुरु:कालिदासो विलास: । हर्पो हर्ष: हृदयवसति पचबाणस्च बाण: केषा नैषा कथय कविताकामिनी कौतुकाय।
Prasannarāghava, Act I, Stanza 22, P. 10.

25. "माल्वराजस्योज्जयिनीराजधानीकस्य कविजनमूर्धन्यस्य रत्नावल्याख्यनाटिकाकर्तुमहाराजश्रीहर्षस्य।
Ind. Ant., Vol. II, 1873, *Pp.* 127-128.

26. *THK., P.* 184.

27. माघश्चोरो मयूरो मुरारिपुरपरो भारवि: सारविद्य:।
श्रीहर्ष: कालिदास: कविरथभवभूत्या यो भोजराज:॥
श्रीदण्डि: डिण्डिमाख्य: श्रुतिमुकुटगुरुर्भल्लटो भट्टबाण:।
ख्यातश्चान्ये सुबन्ध्वादय इह कृतिभिर्विश्वमाह्लादयन्ति।
Subhāṣitaratna-Bhāṇḍāgāra, Ed. by Parab, 5th Ed., Bom., 1911, *Stanza* 68, *P.* 38.

28. *Karmarkar, Nāgānand, Intro., P. ix.*

written by an author who was contemporary to Avantivarman of Kashmīr.[29]

EPIGRAPHIC EVIDENCE

Besides these literary evidences and references also possess the epigraphic records to validate Harsa's claim to authorship and calligraphy.[30] The Banskhera Copper Plate of the year 22 of the Harsa Era and the Madhubana Copper Plate of the year 25 H. E. are of manifold value to us. The first is signed by Harsa himself while the other bears no signature. On the basis of this royal signature and the language therein, it can be stated that these records of the plates "were manifestly dictated by the king."[31] There are many stanzas, common to both these inscriptions which create "apparantly good ground" for the identity of the composer of these records as well as "for recognizing Harsa's gift for writing."[32] If not all "some lines in the Madhubana inscription bear the stamp of Harṣa's authorship."[33] It is clear from his signature in the Banskhera grant that he was also a skilled calligraphist.[34]

OTHER VERSES ATTRIBUTED TO HARṢA

There are some occasional verses in the Sanskrit anthologies which are attributed to Harsa. These verses are quoted in the Kavīndravacha-nasamuchchaya, the Saduktikarnāmṛita and the Subhāsitāvali.[35] We also find two Sanskrit poems of Harsa which "bear the stamp of autheni-

29. *Ibid., P. ix.*

30. *THK., P.* 185; *Harṣa puts his signature in the following style. Ep. Ind., Vol. IV, P.* 210.

31. *Ep. Ind., Vol. IV, Pp.* 208-211.

32. *The same view is held by learned editors of the Priyadarśikā of Harṣa, Ed. and tr. by Nariman, Jackson and Ogden, Columbia University Series,* 1923, *P. xliv.*

33. *Bühler, Ep. Ind., Vol. I, P.* 71; *THK., P.* 185.

34. *Ibid., P.* 185.

35. *F. W. Thomas, Kavīndravachanasamuchchaya, A Sanskrit Anthology of Verses, P.* 117-120.

ticity, particularly because they harmonise with his later Buddhistic tendencies."[36] The first of these two is the Suprabhātastotra, a poem of twenty-four stanzas, each of four lines. This poem speaks of Buddha in a very high tone and with great esteem. The poem mentions Harṣa's name in the colophon.[37] The other poem 'Aṣṭamahāśrīchaityasaṁskṛitastotra' consists of five stanzas and it is preserved in a Chinese transliteration from the original Sanskrit and is attributed to an Indian king called in Chinese, "the Sun of Virtues," a synonym for Śīlāditya.[38] We know that in the Buddhist works Harṣa is generally known as Śīlāditya.

SOME INTERNAL REFERENCE TO HIS AUTHORSHIP

The works of Harṣa themselves contain many proofs which can be cited to validate Harṣa's claim to authorship. It is, indeed, surprising to note that these proofs have not been examined by scholars so far. The three dramas, the Ratnāvalī, the Priyadarśikā and the Nāgānandaṁ contain claims to Harṣa's authorship. Firstly, the stage-manager (Sūtradhāra) gives an introduction in each drama before the assembly. This introductory speech is also the one and the same in each play. The stage-manager says, "We have heard it by a series of rumours that our lord, His Majesty, king Harṣa has composed a play called "Ratnāvalī (or 'Nāgānandaṁ' or 'Priyadarśikā')".[39]

Secondly, there is a stanza in each of the three dramas which again claims Harṣa to be the author. In this stanza the stage-manager

---

36. *Priyadarśikā of Harṣa, Ed. and Tr. by Nariman, Jackson and Ogden, Columbia University Series, P. xliv-xlv; Dr. Keith, History of Sanskrit Literature, P.* 215.

37. *JRAS.*, 1903, *Pp.* 703. *In the opinion of Dr. F. W. Thomas the author of these two poems in question may be the King Harṣa of Kashmīr. Ibid., P.* 704.

38. *Priyadarśikā, P. xiv.*

39. "अस्मत्स्वामिना श्रीहर्षदेवेनापूर्ववस्तुरचनालंकृता रत्नावली नाम नाटिका।" *In case of Nāgānandaṁ or Priyadarśikā the same introduction is found with words,"* नागानन्दं नाम नाटकं या प्रियदर्शिका नाम नाटिका।

tells us, "Śrī Harṣa is the gifted master of poetry; this assembly is also an appreciator of merits; the stories of Bodhisattva (or Vatsarāja) catch the attraction of all; we, too, are skilled in the art of dramatic performance; even each one of these facts would (by itself), be enough to produce the desired effect; but how much more than all this assemblage of excellences combined through the abundance of my good fortune."[40] It also deserves our attention that this stanza is repeated by the stage-manager before the audience. It seems that Harṣa assured his claim to authorship with this device of announcing the same through the stage-manager.

Thirdly, the benedictory stanza (*Bharatavākyaṁ*) of the Priyadarśikā is identical with its counterpart of the Ratnāvalī, except for very slight variations in the two closing lines. But the expression of solemn and benedictional invocation is the same. In both the stanzas Indra is solemnly implored to pour down the wished-for rain and to provide the earth with abundant crops. The Brāhmaṇas are prayed to gratify the gods through the performance of the sacrifices. And an earnest wish for unity among good men and the extinction of the wicked persons is expressed.[41] The

---

40. श्रीहर्षो निपुणः कविः परिषदप्येषा गुणग्राहिणी
लोके हारि च बोधिसत्त्वचरितं नाट्ये च दक्षा वयम् ॥
वस्त्वेकैकमपीह वांछितफलप्राप्तेः पद किं पुन-
र्मद्भाग्योपचयादयं समुदितः सर्वो गुणानां गणः ॥३॥ —नागानंदम्, अंक १।
Nāgānand by Harṣa, Act I, Verse. 3, Ed. Karmarkar, P. 3. In the Priyadarśikā and Ratnāvali we find Vastsarājacharitaṁ in place of 'Bodhisttvacharitaṁ'. Priyadarśikā of Harṣa, Ed. and tr. by Nariman, Jackson, and Ogden, Columbia University Series, Act I, Verse 3, P. 6. and Ratnāvalī, Act I, Verse 6, P. 18. Such devices to assure the claim to authorship are also found in Greek Anthologies, in Persian Odes and in Anglo-Saxon Poems. Priyadarśikā, P. xiv. It must also be remembered that such devices are more common in the songs of Tulsidās, Mirābāī, Sūradāsa, Rahīma, Rasakhān and almost all Indian poets of the Bhakti age.

41. उर्वीमुद्दामसस्यां जनयतु विसृजन वासवो विष्टिमिष्ठा।
मिष्टैस्त्रैविष्ठपानां विदधतु प्रीणनं विप्रमुख्याः॥
आकल्पान्तंच भूयात् समुपचितसुखः सङ्गमः सज्जनानाम्।
निःशेषं यान्तु शान्तिं पिशुनजनगिरो दुर्जया वज्रलेपाः॥८६॥ रत्नावली, चतुर्थांक।

Bharatavākyam of the Nāgānandam, though a little different from those of the Ratnāvalī and the Priyadarsikā, also contains the same sense and purpose In the two concluding stanzas of the Nāgānandam, the same message is conveyed, 'May the clouds send down the timely showers of rains stimulating the peacocks to dance madly and delightfully and making the earth clothed up with growing, continuous and luxurious green harvest May people, living together and freed from calamities assembling together with their friends and kinsmen in intimate gatherings and feasts, rejoice with their hearts free from jealousy and malice '[42]

Fourthly, there are two other instances of the identical stanzas in the Priyadarsika and the Naganandam The third stanza of the third Act of the Priyadarsika is the same as the first stanza of the fourth Act of the Naganandam[43] Similarly the tenth stanza of the third Act of the Priyadarśika and the fourteenth stanza of the first Act of the Naganandam are identical to each other[44]

The two closing lines of Priyadarsika differ slightly They are

आवरपान्तच भयान स्थिर ममुपचिना गगनि सज्जनानाम
निशाप यान्तु शान्नि पिशनज्न गिरा दु मड्रा वज्रलेपा ॥४२॥ प्रियदर्शिका ।

42 वृष्टि हृष्टशिखण्डताण्डवकृतो मुचन्तु काले घना
कुर्वन्त प्रतिरूसन्त हरिच्छस्यात्तराया क्षितिम् ।
चिन्वाना सुकृतानि वीतविपदा निम स्वरा निसै
मोदन्ता सतत च बा न्धवसुहृद्गोष्ठीप्रमोदा प्रजा ॥३ ॥
अपि च
शिवमस्तु सर्वजगता परहितनिरताभवन्तु भूतगणा ।
दोषा प्रयान्तु नाश सर्वत्र भवतु लोक ॥४०॥ नागानन्दम् ।

43 अन्त पुराणा विहितव्यवस्थ पदे पदऽह स्खलितानि रक्षन् ।
जरातुर सम्प्रति दण्डनात्या सर्व नृपस्यानुकरोमि वृत्तम् ॥

Stanza I, Act 4 Naganandam of Harsa Ed, and tr by Sadhuram, Delhi, and Stanza 3, Act 3, Priyadarsika of Harsa, Ed and tr by Nariman, Jackson, and Ogden Columbia University Series, Act 4, Stanza 1

44 व्यक्तिर्व्यंजनधातुना दशविधेनाप्यत्र लब्धामुना ।
विस्पष्टो द्रुतमध्यलम्बितपरिच्छिन्नस्त्रिधाय लय ॥
गोपुच्छाप्रमुखा क्रमेण यतयस्तिस्रोऽपि सपादिता-
स्तत्त्वौघानुगताश्च वाद्यविधय सम्यक् त्रया दर्शिता ॥

Priyadarsika of Harsa, Act III, Stanza 10, Nagānandam of Harsa, Act 1, Stanza 14

One can argue that such identical stanzas are also possible on the simple ground that one of the dramas might have been written earlier than the other and the writer of the drama which would have been written later, might have borrowed the verses from the drama written earlier. Such an argument cannot be easily set aside, but with other factors and proofs in view, these identical stanzas are helpful in determining Harṣa's authorship.

Besides these identical citations some scholars and literary critics have endeavoured to prove the identity of authorship on the basis of phraseological expressions, structural similarities, parallel situations, some common characters and above all the very common theme of the dramas. They hold that on these grounds no one can validly challenge the fact that the author of these works must be one and the same person.

Lastly, we may note that Harsa and his ancestors are definitely known to have been greatly devoted to the Lord Śiva and the Sun. This devotion on the part of Harṣa is also found in his dramas. The opening verses of the Priyadarśikā and the Ratnāvalī praise the Lord Śiva and the Goddess Gaurī or Girijā.[45] In Nāgānandam Gaurī plays an important role and the reference to her is significant. In some verses the Sun's (*Āditya's*) conduct is described in a highly esteemed manner. The hero says, "The Sun who always removes from the lotus-bud the close-clinging seal of sleep fastened (on it), who pleases the whole world by his rays intent on the sole duty of fulfilling the desires of the people and who is seen by the Siddhas with their mouths vocal with continuous hymns of praise is alone praise-worthy, as his effort is only for the good of others."[46] At another occassion

---

45. पादाग्रस्थितया मुहुः स्तनभरेणानीतया नम्रताम् शंभोः सस्पृहलोचनत्रयपथं यान्त्या तदाराधने। ह्रीमत्या शिरसीहितः सपुलकस्वेदोद्गमोत्कम्पया विश्लिष्यन् कुसुमाञ्जलि गिरिजया क्षिप्तोऽन्तरे पातु वः ॥१॥ रत्नावली, प्रथम अंक, श्लोक १।
Similarly in the two Nandī Verses of the Priyadarśikā Hara (Siva), Gauri and the Brāhmaṇas are implored to protect the world.

46. निद्रामुद्रावबन्धव्यतिकरमनिशं पद्मकोशादपास्य-
आशापरककर्मप्रवणनिजकरप्रीणिताशेषविश्वः।

he again tells us about the might of the Sun. He says, "Why do you, O my left eye, throb again and again to foretell me about some evil ? Ah, wretched eye, here, this Sun will destroy (the evil effect of) your throbbing."[47]

This devotion of the author of the dramas to Śiva and the Sun (Āditya) and his sympathetic outlook towards Buddhism rightly validate Harṣa's claims to the authorship of the three dramas.

On the basis of the above-cited evidences it can be safely and conclusively proved that the author of the three dramas, the Priyadarśikā, the Ratnāvalī and the Nāgānandaṁ was one and the same person and that he was no body other than the emperor Harṣa of Kānyakubja.

SOME DOUBTS WITH REGARDS TO HARṢA'S AUTHORSHIP

Notwithstanding the above-discussed points and facts, the question of Harsa's authorship has been a bitterly debated one. The issue has been thoroughly discussed by several scholars. In the foregoing paragraphs it has been discussed that the three plays must be undisputably and conclusively assigned to Harsa. The trend of the opinions of scholars, too, has been steadily growing in Harsa's favour. Even then, there are some strong arguments raised against this view which deserve our attention, and an attempt should be made to refute them.

The controversy first arose in the eleventh century A.D. when a Kashmiri writer Mammaṭa wrote Kāvyaprakāśa.[48] In Kāvyaprakāśa Mammaṭa speaks about the gains and achievements by means of an art of writing poetry.[49] The author first gives an example of Kālidāsa as one

---

दृष्टः सिद्धैः प्रसत्कस्तुतिमुखरमुखरस्तमप्येष गच्छ-
न्नेकः श्लाघ्यो विवस्वान्परहितकारणायैव यस्य प्रयासः ॥१८॥

नागानन्दम्, तृतीयोऽङ्कः ।

47. स्फुरसि किंदक्षिणे क्षण मुहुर्मुहुः कथयितु ममानिष्टम् ।
हन्त बशुरपहृतं ते स्फुरितमिहाय करिष्यते भानुः ॥४॥ नागानन्दम्, पंचमोऽङ्कः ।

48. *Kāvyaprakāśa, Ed. by Jhalkikar, Pp. 6-7; English tr. by Dr. Ganganah Jha, Pp. 1-2.*

49. काव्यं यशसेऽर्थकृते व्यवहारविदे शिवेतरक्षतये ।
सद्यः परनिर्वृतये कांतासम्मितयोपदेशयुजे ॥ काव्यप्रकाश, उ० १, श्लोक २ ।

who got fame and then he says that Dhāvaka and other poets got wealth from Śri-Harṣa and other kings.[50] It is generally understood that it was, most probably, because of the composition of the three dramas that Dhāvaka received enormous wealth from Harṣa, and in return permitted Harṣa to be known as their author.

At the very outset we should remember that reference to Dhāvaka is derived due to some unauthentic manuscripts of the Kāvyaprakāśa. Almost all the manuscripts of Kāvyaprakāśa, discovered in Kashmir, to which region Mammaṭa belonged, read Bāṇa[51] instead Dhāvaka. This fact of the wealth being given by Harṣa to Bāṇa is further recorded by Soḍḍhala who says "that Harṣa honoured Bāṇa with a gift of hundred crores of gold",[52] and on this basis, Dr. Hall opines that Bāṇa was the author of the three dramas and sold them to Harṣa for money.[53] But such an assumption is highly unwarranted and entirely untennable as has been rightly observed by Dr. R.S. Tripathi. He says that Bāṇa's authorship of these dramas is "out of question."[54] It has been emphatically pointed out that a comparative study of the style and language of Harṣacharita and Kādambarī and the dramas assigned to Harṣa, puts Bāṇa out of the controversy. Such presumptions are not generally well-founded. Moreover, if Bāṇa needed money, he could have sold Kādambarī to Harṣa for more amount than that he has been alleged to have received. At the same time it also seems doubtful that Harṣa might have purchased these dramas which are in no way the works of extraordinary brilliance as Kādambarī is generally claimed to be. As a matter of fact, majority of our ancient poets and writers never desired fame and money. That is why we do not find their autobiographies and records of their material achievements.

---

50. *Kāvyaprakāśa Ed. by B. V. Jhalkikar, Pp.* 6-7.
कालिदासादीनामिव यश: श्रीहर्षादेर्धावकादीनामिव धनम्।
51. श्रीहर्षादेर्बाणादीनामिव धनम्।
52. *Cited in THK., Pp.* 185-186.
53. *Dr. Fitzedward Hall, Vāsavadattā, Col.*, 1859, *Preface, Pp.* 15-17, *also P.* 51.
54. *THK., P.* 185.

Truely speaking, the authors of the ancient India wrote devotedly in order to satisfy their own 'Self.' Like the philosophers, saints and sages of this holy land they never longed for money. No doubt, the imperial courts granted liberal patronage to many of the great authors and poets and they are known to have repaid the obligation with liberal praise of their patrons. It may be said that these poets and writers might have been of some assistance in giving finishing touches to the works of their patrons who were also interested in literary creations. The citation in Kāvya-prakāśa, as we find it, that "Śrī-Harṣāder-Dhāvakā(Bāṇa)dīnāmiva dhanaṁ," simply revalidates that Harṣa was a generous patron of poets. There is nothing substantial in the sentence to prove that monetary considerations compelled the poets to put their works under the names of their patrons. Any such misinterpretation may merely be regarded as an attempt to disprove Harṣa's claim to authorship. At the same time the brilliant record of his life and his achievements do not allow us to accept that he would have cared to win such cheap and inglorious popularity. It is ungenerous on the part of scholiasts to come to such an interpretation. Some of the greatest authorities of the east as well as of the west have agreed to rejecting such "assertions of the scholiasts as fictitious and lacking foundation" and they accept the authority of Harṣa's claim as an author of the three dramas."[55]

Some of the scholiasts have also made unsuccessful attempts to prove that the author of the Nāgānandaṁ, which appraises and imparts the lesson of Ahiṁsā, the cardinal point in the doctrine of Buddhist philosophy, could not have written Ratnāvalī and Priyadarśikā, which express devotion to Śiva and Gaurī in the induction.[56] Such a conclusion is not very convincing one. It is not the Buddhism alone that preaches Ahiṁsā. The doctrine of Ashiṁsā has also been penetratingly and thoroughly discussed in the enormous literature of the Jains and the Brāhmaṇas.

On the other hand, we can say that the harmonious blending was perhaps a noble attempt of synthesising the best in the two cults and it

55. *Priyadarśikā, Intro., Part II, P. xlvii.*

56. *Karmarkar, Nāgānand, P. XV.*

represents the author's earnest attepmpts to reconcile the Hindu and the Buddhistic mythologies and creeds. Unlike many crusaders, the monarchs of ancient India were not rigid in the process of implementation of their religious policies and propagation of moral principles. At the same time we have definite proofs of their sympathetic and tolerant outlook towards all sects. Most of the Gupta emperors called themselves as the Parama-Bhāgawatas (the worshippers of Viṣṇu); but it was their tolerant attitude towards all the religions which paved the way for the true revival of Hinduism. In the same way king Harṣa also entertained reverential feelings for other faiths and sects. He inherited the devotion to Śiva from his ancestors and it continued even after he had definite inclination towards Buddhism. We can, therefore, conclude that the authorship of the Nāgānandaṁ can also be assigned to Harṣa, the composer of the Ratnāvalī and the Priyadarśikā.

KAVIVIMARŚA OF RĀJAŚEKHARA

On the basis of Kavivimarśa of Rājaśekhara,[57] a work which has not yet been discovered, further doubts have been raised with regards to Harṣa's authorship and some critics find it naturally convenient to dis-

57. कारणं तु कवित्वस्य न सम्पन्नकुलीनता।
धावकोऽपि हि यद्भासः कवीनामग्रिमोऽभवत् ॥
आदौ भासेन रचिता नाटिका प्रियदर्शिका।
निरीर्ष्यस्य रसज्ञस्य कस्य न प्रियदर्शिना ॥
तस्य रत्नावली नूनं रत्नमालेव राजते।
दशरूपककामिन्या वक्षस्यत्यन्तशोभना ॥
नागानन्दं समालोक्य यस्य श्रीहर्ष विक्रमः।
अमन्दानन्दभरितः स्वसभ्यमकरोत्कविम् ॥
उदात्तराघवं नूनमुदात्तगुणगुम्फितम्।
यद्वीक्ष्य भवभूत्याद्या प्रणिन्युर्नाटिकानि वै ॥
शोकपर्यवसानास्य नवांकः किरणावली।
माकन्दस्यव कस्यात्र प्रददाति नर्विवृतिम् ॥
भासनाटकचक्रेऽपिच्छेकैः क्षिप्त परीक्षितुम्।
स्वप्नवासवदत्तस्य दाहकोऽभून्न पावकः ॥

approve the claims of Harṣa as the author of the Priyadarśikā, the Ratnāvalī and the Nāgānandaṁ. Such assumption, as the citation enables the critics to conclude, is really convincing and trustworthy if the genuine character of the citation itself is beyond question; but the Kavivimarśa of Rājaśekhara itself has been a subject of literary controversy. It has not yet been traced out. In its absence, this attempt of disapproving Harṣa's authorship seems to be ill-conceived or forged one. It can never enjoy solid foundations except a hearsay evidence.

LATER CRITICISM

Many critics of the seventeenth century also participated in this controversy and it was attempted to prove that Dhāvaka wrote the plays in Harṣa's name. In his Kāvyapradīpoddyota, Nagoji says that Dhāvaka composed the Ratnāvalī and gained enough money by assigning it to Harṣa.[58] Another commentator Parmananda also repeats the same charge.[59] He says ,"A poet known as Dhāvaka got enormous wealth by selling his work Ratnāvalī to Śrī-Harṣa."[60]

These charges have been completely invalidated by historians. It may be pointed out that the very historicity of Dhāvaka as a Sanskrit poet has also been challenged.[61] It has been maintained that Dhāvaka as a poet is unknown to Sanskrit Literature and that these "doubting authors belong to the 16th or 17th century A.D.; and this distance in time from Harṣa considerably lessens the weight of their authority."[62]

Mr. S. M. Paranjape has raised another objection to the claims of Harṣa's authorship. On the basis of some internal evidences and

---

58. धावकः कविः स हि श्रीहर्षनामा रत्नावलीं कृत्वा बहुधनं लब्धवान् इति प्रसिद्धम्।
Kāvyaprakāśa, Ed. by D. Chandorkar, P. 5.

59. धावकनामा कविः स्वकृतिं रत्नावलीं नाम नाटिकां विक्रीय श्रीहर्षनाम्नो राज्ञः सकाशाद् बहुधनमवापेति पुरावृत्तम् ।
Bhandarkar's Report on Sanskrit Manuscripts (1882), *No.* 208.

60. *Priyadarśikā, P. xlvii.*

61. *THK., P.* 186.

62. *Ibid., Pp.* 186-187.

analogical references he concludes that the author of the three plays must have belonged to the fifth century A.D. and that he must be Bhāsa.[63]

But such a conclusion, based upon the close correspondence and similar references, can not claim any unchallengeable infallibility. Mr. Paranjape's conclusion has no substantial basis in the absence of strong and unimpeachable grounds. Mr. Karmarkar has rightly observed that such analogy would lead us to conclude that Harṣa was most intimately acquainted with the works of Bhāsa."[64] Parallels are often found in many literary works and we cannot conclude justifiably that all of them are of one and the same author. Moreover, almost all the scholars and orientalists have come to a common and final conclusion that the author of the Priyadarśikā, the Ratnāvalī and the Nāgānandaṁ must be placed later than the sixth century A.D. and they are certainly the works of Harṣa.

SECTION B.

LITERARY ESTIMATE OF HARṢA

We have seen that Harṣa is credited with the authorship of the three dramas, the Priyadarśikā, the Ratnāvalī, and the Nāgānandaṁ. He is also assigned the authorship of two short Sanskrit poems, the 'Suprabhāta-Stotra'[1] bearing Harṣa's name as an author and 'Aṣṭamahāśrīchaitya-Sanskrit-Stotra'.[2]

---

63. *Sāhityasaṁgraha (Marāṭhī), cited in introductory chapter of the Nāgānandaṁ, Edited by Karmarkar, P. xix.*

64. *Ibid.*, *P. xx.*

1. *JRAS.*, 1903, *Pp.* 703 *ff. But one important point raised here is that Late Dr. Thomas identified the author (Harṣa) with king Harṣa of Kashmir. Ibid., P.* 704*; Ettinghausen, Harṣavardhana, Pp.* 168-175. *As noted above the poem bears the name of Harṣa in the colophon.*

2. *As the name suggests, this encomium of Eight Buddhist Shrines was rendered into Chinese transliteration from its original Sanskrit. Ettinghausen, Harṣvardhana, Pp.* 176*ff; Levi, Orientalis Stenkongresse, X. II.; Pp.* 165*ff, cited in the History of Sanskrit Literature by A. B. Keith, P.* 215*; ascribes the authorship of this religious poem to an Indian King who was called the "Sun of Virtue", i. e. Śīlāditya, another name given to Harṣa in the Buddhist world.*

Of the plays ascribed to Harṣa, the Priyadarśikā appears to be his first work.[3] It is a four-act drama (nāṭikā)[4] in real sense of the term as we shall see later. It receives its title from the name of its heroine, Priyadarśikā, who is called Āraṇyakā throughout the play up to the time of her identity was disclosed. The drama is claimed to have been graced (alaṁkṛitā) by the treatment (vasturachanā) of a novel subject (apūrva).[5] This claim is recurringly expressed in the introduction of the two other dramas.[6]

1. *THE PRIYADARŚIKĀ*

The Priyadarśikā is a romantic comedy of a highly fascinating character. It beautifully narrates the story of courtship between the king and a princess in disguise, secret meetings between them, natural and womanly jealousy of the chief queen and latter's sudden change of heart when the heroine is revealed to be her lost cousin. The story of the Priyadarśikā runs as follows :

"Dṛḍhavarman, the king of the country of Aṅga had made a promise to marry his daughter Priyadarśikā to king Vatsarāja Udayana, the ruler of the country of Vatsa with his capital at Kauśāmbī. He is the hero of the play.

"This move for a matrimonial alliance between the two royal houses of Aṅga and Vatsa enraged the king of Kaliṅga who was keen to marry

3. *I propose to deal with the order of the composition of these works at a later stage.*

4. *A nāṭikā has, generally speaking, four Acts whereas a nāṭaka contains five or more Acts and deals with a comparatively wider scope of theme and treatment of the subject. Dhanañjaya, Daśrūpa.* 3. 46-52. *Edited and translated by Dr. Hass, Columbia University Indo-Iranian Series, Vol.* 7, *New York*, 1912, *Pp.* 95-98.

5. *Priyadarśikā, Act I, Pp.* 4-7.

6. *Ratnāvalī, tr. and ed. by Prof. V. K. Joshi and Prof. G. M. Walve,* P. 3; *Nāgānandaṁ, tr. and ed. by Prof. Asha Toraskar and Prof. A. N. Deshpande, p.* 6.

the Aṅga princess Priyadarśikā. Consequently he marched against Dṛḍhavarman and devastated his kingdom. Dṛḍhavarman was defeated and was made prisoner. But his daughter Priyadarśikā was fortunately saved by her father's chamberlain named Vinayavasu. The latter took her to the Vindhya region and placed her under the protection and guardianship of the king Vindhyaketu, the ruler of that region. He, then, left the place on a pilgrimage.

"As the fate would have it, Priyadarśikā could not enjoy the peaceful stay for long here also. While the chamberlain was out on the pilgrimage, Vindhyaketu, too, was attacked and killed in a battle. When the chamberlain returned he could not get any trace of the princess. Later, we are told in the drama that Vindhyaketu lost his life fighting against Vijayasena, the senāpati of Vatsarāja. Vijayasena led an expedition against Vindhyaketu for the reasons not known from the drama. The result was fatal to Vindhyaketu who lost the war and was ultimately killed in the battle fighting against Vijayasena. In addition to the spoils of the war, Vijayasena also brought with him a young maiden. She was Priyadarśikā, but as she did not disclose her identity she was supposed to be the daughter of Vindhyaketu.

"In accordance with the instructions from the king Udayana himself she was placed in charge of the chief queen Vāsavadattā with instructions for her princely education and training in all womanly accomplishments such as dance and music. He also directed to be informed when she reached a marriageable age.

"One day, after a year or so, king Vatsa, while walking in the garden of the royal palace saw Āraṇyakā (called so for having been found in the āraṇya or forest), the supposed daughter of king Vindhyaketu. She was sent there by the queen Vāsavadattā to collect lotuses required to be offered in religious worship. There in the garden she was suddenly attacked by the bees buzzing over the lotuses. She cried Indīvārikā for help; but, as the latter was at some distance, the king, after being requested by the Vidūṣaka, rushed to help her and, apparently, found an opportunity to praise her lotus-like beauty. Āraṇyakā was alarmed at the sudden appearance of a man and again cried Indīvārikā for help. When she

learnt that her rescuer was the king Vatsarāja himself who was chosen as her husband by her father, she felt infatuated with passionate love and earnest desire to meet him again. Similar was the response from the king who was also very much attracted by her rare charm and exceptional beauty.

After a short interval after this meeting, Sāṁkṛityāyanī, the queen's intimate friend, composed a drama representing an incident of the love-affair of the king Udayana and his queen Vāsavadattā. It was just incidentally that in this dramatic performance Āraṇyakā was to play the role of the queen and Manoramā, the attendant of the queen, was entrusted with the role of the king. It was at that time the king himself entered secretly to perform his own role and thus got an opportunity to express his love to Āraṇyakā. This secret plot could not work successfully and the queen soon learnt the truth. She got very angry and ordered immediate arrest of both the Vidūṣaka and Āraṇyakā. Even king's personal expression of apology could not pacify the queen and all attempts to bring reconciliation were in vain. Āraṇyakā was sent to the prison.

In the mean-time, queen Vāsavadattā received a message from her mother with the contents that king Dṛḍhavarman, the husband of her mother's sister was in captivity of the king of Kaliṅga. She was very sorry for his (Dṛḍhavarman's) plight, but the news of the triumphant expedition under Vijayasena, a general of king Udayana, gladdens her heart. He was immediately followed by the chamberlain of Dṛḍhavarman. The chamberlain had brought the grateful homage of his master, but his account of the disappearance of the princess Priyadarśikā moved the queen deeply. She had no knowledge till that time that Āraṇyakā and Priyadarśikā were one and the same girl. She had, however, ordered her release, but, at that very time, we learn that Āraṇyakā had taken poison. This news was conveyed to the queen by Manoramā. The queen was very much upset and ordered to bring Āraṇyakā before her. She was in a very serious condition. The chamberlain of Dṛḍhavarman immediately recognised her as his master's lost daughter. The king Udayana practised his anti-poison formula which he had learnt in the Nāga world and restored Priyadarśikā to life. Queen Vāsavadattā was overwhelmed with joy to find

her lost cousin Priyadarśikā. The latter became the lawful wife of king Vatsarāja Udayana as she was already pledged by her father. Thus the drama comes to a happy end.

2. *THE RATNĀVALĪ*

Like Priyadarśikā, it is also a four-Act drama.[7] There is the closest structural similarity between the Priyadarśikā and the Ratnāvalī. We find the likeness in theme, ideas, manners, method of treatment and corresponding situations. This will be clear from its story. It runs as follows :

"Ratnāvalī, the daughter of the king Vikramabāhu, the ruler of Ceylon, was betrothed to be married to the king Udayana of Kauśāmbī. His chief queen was Vāsavadattā. It was during a voyage Ratnāvalī was shipwrecked; but was, fortunately, saved and brought to the court of king Udayana. The latter's Chief Minister placed her under the guardianship of the queen Vāsavadattā without disclosing that she was the princess of Ceylon already betrothed to her husband Udayana. Throughout the play she is known as Sāgarikā. She was so named because she was saved from the sea after the shipwreck.

"One day the king saw Sāgarikā in the palace garden. Both of them fell in love with each other at the very first sight. The courtship continued, but the chief queen Vāsavadattā soon learnt of it, and, as a result of her natural jealousy, she imprisoned Sāgarikā along with the Vidūṣaka. One day, when the king's palace was on artificial fire caused by a feat of a magician, the king promptly saved Sāgarikā. It was at that very moment Vasubhūti, the Prime Minister of her father, who, like the princess, also escaped death in the shipwreck in which the princess was allegedly supposed to have been drowned, appeared on the scene. His sudden appearance resulted in revealing an identity of Sāgarikā with Ratnāvalī. The queen Vāsavadattā, who was related to her as a cousin,

---

7. *According to A. Berriedale Keith it "has served to illustrate the technical rules" of a nāṭikā. The Sanskrit Drama in its Origin Development Theory and Practice, Oxford University Press, Sec. Reprint,* 1959, *P.* 171.

accepted her (Ratnāvalī) as a co-wife. This drama also comes to a happy end."

3. *THE NĀGĀNANDAṀ*

Literary critics are fully justified in regarding the Nāgānandaṁ as one of the best plays of the Sanskrit literature.[8] The central theme is that of a great sacrifice of a man who gives up his life to save that of a serpent. Unlike the Priyadarśikā and the Ratnāvalī, it is a five-Act play.[9] The story is simple and "Buddhistic in tone and theme." The story is as follows :

"Jīmūtavāhana, the Vidyādhara prince, who is the hero of the drama, left his kingdom in the hands of his ministers and went to the forest in order to wait upon and to serve his parents who had already left the worldly life. He was accompanied by his friend Vidūṣaka during his march to the forest.

The hero and his friend went to the Malaya mountain to find out some suitable site for their residence. Jīmūtavāhana was very much pleased with the beautiful scenery at the mountain and determined to make it his abode. In the meantime he heard some song and followed the sound of it. When he reached there, he saw a beautiful maiden named Malayavatī at the temple of the goddess Gaurī. Both of them fell in love with each other at the very first sight. At this moment a sage arrived and called Malayavatī back to her residence. The hero and his friend also retired to their abode.

"When Malayavatī and her maid Chaturikā were in the sandal-bower, Jīmūtavāhana and Vidūṣaka reached there. Malayavatī and Chaturikā remained concealed. In the meantime Mitravasu, Malayavatī's

---

8. *A. B. Keith, The Sanskrit Drama, Pp.* 176-180; *S. K. De, History of Sanskrit Literature, Pp.* 255-262.

9. *Nāgānandaṁ is a nāṭaka in real sense of the term as understood by Indians. For the study of origin, object, scope, method and general characterists of drama a reference be made to the History of Sanskrit Literature by Sushil Kumar De, Pp.* 42-68.

brother, offered his sister to the hero. Jīmūtavāhana rejected the offer as he did not know that Malayavatī and his beloved were one and the same girl. When Mitravasu had been away to negotiate with Jīmūtavāhana's father, Malayavatī attempted to commit suicide. Chaturikā, who remained concealed, just close by, raised a cry for help. Jīmūtavāhana rushed forward and saved Malayavatī. At this moment another maid informed that Jīmūtavāhana's father had consented to accept Malayavatī as his daughter-in-law, and the marriage was celebrated the same day.

"After the marriage was over the hero and heroine lived happily. During this period Mitravasu brought the news of the invasion by Mātaṅga, and expressed his readiness to fight against Mātaṅga. Jīmūtavāhana rejected war to avoid the inhuman slaughter of the people.

"Once Jīmūtavāhana went to the sea-shore and saw the heaps of the bones of the serpents. Mitravasu gave an account as to how the bones of the serpents came to be piled up there. He also informed about an agreement concluded between Garuḍa, the serpent-killer, and the serpent king Vāsuki. The latter had promised to send each day one serpent for the former. Jīmūtavāhana determined to save the life of one serpent, at least, by offering himself to Garuḍa. By this time Mitravasu retired from the scene as he was called by his father. Then came Śaṁkhachūḍa, the serpent, with his old mother who was weeping severely as his son was to be swallowed by Garuḍa. Jīmūtavāhana offered his own life for that of the serpent.

"As soon as this news reached the parents of Jīmūtavāhana and Malayavatī, they were overwhelmed with grief and went to the peak of the Malaya mountain with the sacrificial fire with which they intended to kill themselves. When Garuḍa came to know his mistake that he had eaten a noble prince instead of the serpent, he at once flew up to bring Amṛita from Indra to give back the life of Jīmūtavāhana. The parents of Jīmūtavāhana and Malayavatī had prepared to throw themselves into the fire. At this moment the Goddess Gaurī appeared before them and revived Jīmūtavāhana. At the same time Amṛita was showered by Garuḍa and all the dead serpents got back their lives. Gauri installed Jīmūtavāhana

as the Emperor of the Vidyādharas. Mātaṅga and other adversaries accepted his sovereignty. At this point the drama comes to an end."

HARṢA'S MERITS AS A DRAMATIST
HARṢA'S SUCCESS IN WRITING THE NĀṬIKĀS

As noted above, both the Priyadarśikā and the Ratnāvalī are the nāṭikās and Harṣa has very successfully dealt with them in accordance with the rules laid down in the works on dramaturgy. The two dramas display the closest resemblance between themselves. Commenting on this point, Prof. Sushilkumar De has rightly observed that "these dramas are practically variations of a single theme in almost identical form." According to him, "the striking similarity of structures and situations is more than merely accidental."[10] A detailed study of these points is made in the pages that follow.

Reference has already been to the repeated induction of the each play and the benedictory stanzas at the close of the plays, and now more details pertaining to repeated and identical phases, situations, thoughts and similarities in the structure will now be brought to light. It may, however, be remembered that such evidences are some of the general and familiar features of the Sanskrit drama. But these similarities, to such a great extent, are certainly more than were generalities. They exist nowhere to such an extent as we notice them between the Priyadarśikā and the Ratnāvalī.

We find the closest identity in many matters such as style, plot, story, theme, situations, treatment of the subject and ideals of these two dramas.[11] We also find many common characters. King Vatsarāja Udayana figures as the hero of these dramas. His chief queen Vāsavadattā also figures very prominently. Another important common character is Vasantaka, the Vidūṣaka and an intimate friend of the hero. Similarly we find queen Vāsavadattā's principal maid-servant Kāñchanamālā.

10. *S. K. De, History of Sanskrit Literature, P.* 256.

11. *A detailed analysis of these is made in the section A of the present chapter.*

Among other characters reference may also be made to Rumaṇvant. He appears in the Priyadarśikā in the role of a minister, but in the Ratnāvalī he comes before us as a great military general who led successful military expeditions. These expeditions are described in details in the play.

Some difference, however, is noticed in the role of Yaugandharāyaṇa. In the Ratnāvalī he appears as a distinguished minister whereas in the Priyadarśikā he finds mention, not in a very significant manner, in the Mimic Play.

Female characters are almost the same, but they appear with different names. Kāñchanamālā alone finds an identical place in both the dramas.

The striking parallels are marked in the roles of Āraṇyakā and Sāgarikā, the heroines of the nāṭikās. The main story of both these plays centres round these lost princesses. As soon as the prastāvanā is over, in the Priyadarśikā, we learn that Vinayavasu, the chamberlain (*Kañchukī*) comes in the explanatory scene (*Viṣakaṁbhaka*)[12] to tell us the sad and unfortunate plight of Priyadarśikā after her father lost the battle against Kaliṅga. The princess was placed in charge of the king Vindhyaketu of the Vindhya forest regions. Here, too, the princess could not enjoy peace for long. Her guardian, king Vindhyaketu, was also attacked and killed in the battle. The old chamberlain had no knowledge of the whereabouts of the princess.

Similar situation is found in the Ratnāvalī where we find that Sāgarikā, the princess of Ceylon, who escaped death in a shipwreck and was resuced by a merchant of Kauśāmbī, was placed under the guardianship of king Vatsarāja Udayana. Thus both the princesses are placed in charge of queen Vāsavadattā.

The situations of the first meeting of king Vatsa and the heroine are also almost the same. It happens in the garden where Āraṇyakā and

---

12. *Viṣakaṁbhaka is one of the five Intermediate scenes (arthopakṣepaka) devised in order to convey an intimation. According to Dhanañjaya it is "presented by middling characters and is for the purpose of condensing" and explaining the "parts of the story that have happened or are about to happen."*

Sāgarikā, the heroines, had been with their confidants, Indivārikā and Susaṁgatā, respectively.

Many points of similarities in situations and styles are marked in the garden scene of the plays. The part played by the Vidūṣaka is almost similar in both of them. In both the dramas similar schemes have been devised to arrange the meetings of the hero and the heroine. The Vidūṣaka and the maid-servant play an important part in preparing ground for these meetings. These secretly-planned schemes are disclosed to the chief queen Vāsavadattā who plays the role of a dominant wife. The latter puts the Vidūsaka and the heroine in the jail. Their release from the imprisonment is also similar in both the dramas and was ordered by the queen under similar circumstances. The heroine in both the plays comes to the point of death and is saved by the king himself. She was ultimately recognized as the lost princess related to the chief queen Vāsavadattā. The latter, therefore, willingly accepts her as a co-wife. This happy occasion is immediately followed by an announcement of the military triumphs of the armies of king Udayana.

In addition to these striking similarities and parallel situations we must also refer to other parallels pertaining to the style, thought and general description observed throughout the plays.

We find an identical expression of king Vatsarāja's satisfaction over the affairs of the State. In the Priyadarśikā he says, "I am convinced of the constancy of the servitors; I have the wisdom of my councillors; I have also proved my friends and know full well the devotion of my people; I have satisfied my passion for the dangers of battle; I have won the pearl of women (*Vāsavadattā*) what, indeed, have I not gained by my captivity, as though by piety unfeigned ?"[13]

---

13. मृत्यानामविकारिता परिगता दृष्टा मतिर्मन्त्रिणा
मित्राण्यप्युपलक्षितानि विदितः पौरानुरागोऽधिकम्।
निर्व्यूंढा रणसाहसव्यसनिता स्त्रीरत्नमासादितं
निर्व्याजादिव धर्मतः किमिव न प्राप्तं मया बन्धनात् ॥६॥

—प्रियदर्शिका, अंक १।

The translation adopted above is from the English translation of the Pri-

In the Ratnāvalī we find the same sentiments with some slight variations. The king says, "The kingdom has all (its) enemies vanquished. The entire burden (of administration) has been entrusted to the suitable minister. The people are happy with all protections. Pradyota's daughter (Vāsavadattā), the spring season and you (friend Vidūṣaka) are there. Let Cupid, therefore, derive as much as satisfaction of mind as he desires, from the (mere) name (of the festival); but, all the same, I consider this great Cupid festival to be mine."[14]

The next parallels between the two are found in the reports of the generals about their successful military expeditions. In the Priyadarśikā, we learn that General Vijayasena was dispatched against Vindhyaketu. When he returned after his victories over the forest king Vindhyaketu, he reports to the king of his successful mission. Similarly in the Ratnāvalī, the general, who was dispatched against Kośala, gives an almost identical account of his expedition.

There are striking similarities in the descriptions of the battles also. When the king expressed his desire to listen to an account of the battle in detail,[15] the Generals give their respective accounts. In the Priyadarśikā we find Vijayasena saying, "Your Majesty, hear. With an army of elephants, cavalry and infantry, as directed by Your Majesty's command, we traversed the road from here, though long, in three days.

---

yadarśikā, edited and translated by Nariman, Jackson, and Ogden, Columbia University Indo-Iranian Series, Vol. X, Pp. 10-11.

14. राज्यं निर्जितशत्रु योग्यसचिवे न्यस्तः समस्तो भरः
सम्यक्पालनलालिताः प्रशमिताशेषोपसर्गाः प्रजाः।
प्रद्योतस्य सुता वसन्तसमयस्त्वं चैति नाम्ना धृतिः,
कामः काममुपत्वयं मम पुनर्मन्ये महानुत्सवः॥९॥ —रत्नावली, अंक १।

Ratnāvalī, ed. and tr. Prof. V. K. Joshi and Prof. G. M. Watve. In the Ratnāvalī's edition by Godbole and Parab, however the verse under question is the tenth stanza of Act I.

15. 'विस्तरतः श्रोतुमिच्छामि', प्रियदर्शिका, प्रथमोऽङ्कः, पृ० १३।

Priyadarśikā, Eng. tr. Act I, Pp. 14-15. *Exactly similar words are used in the Ratnāvalī. Ratnāvalī, Act IV, P.* 136.

At daybreak, while our presence was wholly unsuspected, we fell upon Vindhyaketu."[16]

Similarly in the Ratnāvali we find Vijayasena,[17] the victorious general, saying, "Your Majesty, listen. At your command, in only some (few) days, having marched (lit gone) with a large collection of army, irresistible, on account of numerous elephants, horses and foot soldiers; and having blocked the gates of the king of Kośala who had taken resort in a fort on Vindhya mountain, we began to arrange the formation of our army."[18] In response to this description the king again expresses his anxiety with indentical words "then, then."[19] Such common details of descriptions, parallels in phrases, style and thought are so many that it is difficult to refer to them all.

Svastivāchana rites (*sotthivāna*)[20] and gifts to Brāhmaṇas on the occasions of worship and religious performances figure identically in the dramas. The Vidūṣaka, a Brāhmaṇa, also expresses the same anxiety and eagerness for the gifts.

The heroines of these plays, while looking at the hero, say in almost similar expression that they were pledged to be married to him (king Udayana) by their respective fathers.[21]

---

16. *Priyadarśikā, Act I, Pp.* 14-15 देव श्रूयताम्। इतो वयं देवपादादेशयथादिष्टेन करितुरगपदातिसैन्येन महान्तमप्यध्वानं दिवसत्रयेणोलङ्घ्य प्रभातवेलायामतर्किता एव विन्ध्यकेतोरुपरि निपतितास्मः।" प्रिय०, च० अ०, पृ० १३।

17. *There is a slight variation in the name of the generals.*

18. देव श्रूयताम्। वयमितो देवादेशात्कति पयरेवाहोभिरनेककरितुरगपत्तिसदुर्निवारेण महता बलसमूहेन गत्वा विन्ध्यदुर्गावस्थितस्य कोशलाधिपतेद्वारिमवष्टभ्य सेनाः समावेशयितुमारब्धाः।

—*Ratnāvali, Act IV, Ed. and tr. Joshi and Watve, P.* 136.

19. 'ततस्तः'—प्रियदर्शिका, अंक १, पृ० १३; रत्नावली, अंक ४, पृ० १३६।

20. *Priyadarśikā, Act II, Pp.* 20 *ff;* प्रिय०, हिन्दी संस्करण, पृ० २०-२२ और आगे रत्नावली, अंक १, पृ० १९ और आगे।

21. 'अयं खलु स महाराजो यस्याहं तातेन दत्ता'—प्रिय०, द्वि० अं०, पृ० ३७।

In the Ratnāvali we find it with a slight variation. It reads as 'कथमयं स राजा उदयनो यस्याहं तातेन दत्ता'।

—*Ratnāvali, Act I, P.* 31.

The description of the Makaranda garden in the Ratnāvalī[22] reminds us of a beautiful account of the garden attached to the dhārāgṛiha in the identical language in the Priyadarśikā.[23]

The expressions of disgust and despair by the heroines also appear in identical tone.[24] When Sāgarikā found that her love for the king would hardly succeed, she says to hereself with a sigh, "Be calm, my heart, be calm. What use is this resistence on yearning for a person difficult to obtain."[25] At the time of similar state of mind Priyadarśikā says, "O my heart, why does thou make me so unhappy by longing for one that hardly be thine ?"[26] The remedies for pacifying the agonizing passion for the hero are also the same. When it became unbearable to resist the passion we find that lotus leaves (*nalinīpatrāṇi*) were applied to the heart of the heroine."[27]

Similarly the king's intensified excitement for meeting the heroine, his expressions of love, queen's anger when she learnt of her husband's love-affairs with Āraṇyakā and Sāgarikā respectively, and king's persuasive attempts at pacifying the queen with apologetic tone, description of queen's anger with frowning brows and ultimately king's falling at her feet display a close similarity and identity of expression and phraseology. The scenes depicting the story of recognition of the heroines and Vāsavadattā's expression of overwhelming joy when she learnt of her relationship with the lost princesses also exibit the same identical approach.[28]

---

22. *Ratnāvali, I, Pp.* 20.

23. *Priyadarśikā, II, Pp.* 22-25; प्रिय० पृ० २२-२४।

24. *Similarity in the action and state of mind of Sāgarikā and Āraṇyakā is remarkable. Ratnāvali, P.* 37. ततः प्रविशति मदनावस्थां नाटयन्ती सागरिका।

Almost similar description is found in the Priyadarśikā. P. 42, ततः प्रविशत्यासनस्था कामावस्था नाट्यन्त्यारण्यका।

25. 'हृदयप्रसीद प्रसीद। किमनेनायासमात्रफलेन दुर्लभजनप्रार्थनानुबन्धेन।' *Ratnāvali, II, P.* 37.

26. 'हृदय, दुर्लभजनं प्रार्थयमानं त्वं कस्मान्मां दुःखितां करोषि'—प्रियदर्शिका, पृ० ४२। *Eng. Tr. III, Pp.* 38-39.

27. *Priyadarśikā, III, Pp.* 43 *ff; Ratnāvali, II, Pp.* 43 *ff.*

28. *Prof. Sushilkumar De, History of Sanskrit Literature, Pp.* 256-258.

These are some of the examples and space does not permit me to refer to them all. Dr. S. K. De has rightly observed that "the extraordinary similarity of plot development, however, neatly conducted, as well as the close resemblance of the characters, makes the one play almost a repetition or recast of the other."[29]

Such similarities and parallels in minor details, style and thought, identical phraseology are also found between the Ratnāvalī and the Nāgānandaṁ and the Priyadarśikā and the Nāgānandaṁ. These are not, however, to that extent as we have noticed between the Priyadarśikā and the Ratnāvalī. Nāgānandaṁ is a drama with a different aim and purpose and, therefore, these similarities and parallels are not so conspicuous as we have just noted. It may also be remembered that parallels and identical references are not uncommon in Sanskrit dramas. This may be because of a common approach to a drama and its creation with a common purpose.

VALIDITY OF HARṢA'S CLAIM TO ORIGINALITY

In his dramas Harṣa repeatedly and unmistakably refers to in the Induction that "the dramas are graced" (*alaṁkṛitā*) by the completely new (*apūrva*) treatment of subject (*Vasturachanā*). This claim of Harṣa does not sound well for we know it for certain that the stories of these dramas are borrowed from earlier literary works, and, therefore, any claim to originality is to be confined to the recasting of old stories and legends and proper ordering of the details of the plays in accordance with the rules laid down in the works on dramaturgy. In the Priyadarśikā and the Ratnāvalī the story centres round the hero, king Udayana[30] or Vatsarāja,[31]

29. *Ibid.*, P. 258.

30. *In Pāli works he is known as Udena whereas in Sanskrit works he is referred to as Udayana.*

31. *This name simply denotes that he was the king of the country of Vatsa or the Vatsas, i.e. the people of Vatsa country. This name or such epithet is not found in earlier texts.*

of the country of Vatsas[32] with his capital at Kauśāmbī.[33] He enjoys an eminent place in our traditions, legends and literature and, therefore, we

32. *Vatsas are also mentioned as Vaṁśas among the Soḍasmahājanapadas. Rhys Davids, Buddhist India, New york,* 1903, *P. 3ff; Cambridge History of India, Vol. I, Pp.* 187-188; *History and Culture of the Indian people, Vol. II (Age of Imperial Unity), Bhartiya Vidya Bhavan, Bombay, ed. by Dr. R. C. Majumdar, Pp.* 1-15.

33. *One of the most important centres of trade and culture, Kauśāmbī played an important role in the political history of India. It is righty identified with modern Kosham near Allahabad. This identification was first established by Major-General Cunningham. Archaeological Survey of India Reports, Vol. I, Pp.* 301-12; *Ibid., Vol. X, Pp.* 1-3; *Ibid., XXI, Pp.* 1-3. *This view is also held by Fuhrer. Archaeological Survey Reports, New Imperial Series, Vol. XII, Pp.* 140-143; *Sir V. A. Smith was first to doubt this theory of identification in his article in the Journal of Royal Asiatic Society,* 1898, *Pp.* 503-19. *His reasonning is that it is not in conformity with the evidences supplied by Yuan Chuang. Thomas Watters supports Smith in his 'On Yuan Chuang's Travels in India', Vol. I, Pp.* 365-72. *Reference may also be made to Buddhist Records of the Western World, tr. by Samuel Beal, Vol. I, Pp.* 234-39; *Life of Hiuen-Tsiang, tr. Beal, Pp. 90ff. In the light of modern researches Smith's stand of identifying Kauśāmbī with Satnā is untenable. Watters also does not agree with him. Watters, I, Pp.* 365-7. *Literary evidences support the identification of Kauśāmbī with Kosham. Dhammapāla Theragāthā Commentary Its Summary by Mrs. Rhys Davids, "Psalms of the Brethern, London,* 1913, *Pp.* 159-60, *Sutta-Nipāta Comm., edited by H. Smith, Lond.,* 1917, *II.* 514; *Chullavagga,* 11.1.12; *Saṁyutta-Nikāya, edited by Feer, London,* 1894. 5. 179; *Bṛihatkathā's lokasaṁgraha,* 4.14. *Epigraphic evidences, too, support this view. Ep. Ind., Vol. II, Pp.* 234-44, *Journal of Asiatic Society of Bengal, V, P.* 73. *Reference may also be made to Cambridge History of India, Vol. I, Pp.* 524-26. *The recent excavations at Kauśāmbī conducted under the guidance of Prof. G. R. Sharma, Head of the Department of Ancient Indian History, Culture and Archaeology, University of Allahabad, have brought Kauśāmbī on the archaeological map of India and now there can not be two opinions about this identification of Kauśāmbī with modern Kosham.*

must try to ascertain his place historically and I propose to discuss this problem in detail.

According to the Purāṇic evidences Udayana belonged to the famous line of the Pāṇḍavas. We are told that Yudhiṣṭhira, the eldest of the five Pāṇḍavas, was the first to be installed as an emperor after the conclusion of the Bhārata War. He was succeeded by Parīkṣita, grandson of Arjuna and son of Abhimanyu by his wife Uttarā. It was mainly because of his efforts, and more so due to the achievements of his son Janamejaya, the Pāṇḍavas could become the masters of a great kingdom. The total number of rulers in this dynasty varies from twentysix to thirty.[34] It was during the reign of the sixth ruler in the line, named Nichaksu (Vivakṣu according to Matsya Purāṇa, Kṛisṇa according to Garuḍa and Nemichakra according to Bhāgavata Purāṇa), the kingdom of the Kurus had to face many natural devastating calamities. There was complete destruction of crops in that land of the Kurus.[35] Their capital, the great city of Hastināpura, was washed away in floods.[36] These circumstances forced a mass migration of the Kurus to the Vatsa country.[37]

It was probably due to their old connexions with the country of Vatsa they preferred that land. We learn that the people of the Vatsa country had fought as an ally of the Pāṇḍavas in their struggle with the Kauravas for political supremacy.[38]

Our knowledge of the history after this migration under Nichakṣu

---

34. *According to Garuḍa Purāṇa, 26 rulers are said to have ruled in this dynasty. Viṣṇu Pu. refers to 29 kings, Matsya Pu. to 28, Bhāgavata to 27 and Vāyu Pu to 30. But they all agree to say that the first and the last kings were Abhimanyu and Kṣemaka respectively.*

35. *It was probably due to locust menace or heavy hailstorms. Chhāndogyopaniṣad, I,* 10.1.

36. *Pargiter, Dynasties of the Kali Age, P.* 5.

37. *Pargiter, on the other hand, opines that the immediate cause of this migration was the pressure from Punjab. Ancient Indian Historical Traditions, P.* 285.

38. *Ibid., Pp.* 269*ff.*

is meagre. We have just the names of rulers who are said to have ruled over Vatsa from Nichakṣu to Kṣemaka. It was only king Udayana who won much glory and renown for his dynasty and the capital. We learn from the Purāṇas that he was the fifth king from the last king Kṣemaka. He succeeded his father Śatānīka II[39] and was succeeded by Ahīnara.[40]

The king Udayana was a very powerful ruler and has been assigned a significant role in many legends, traditions and literary work,[41] He was contemporary to Buddha,[42] and is said to have outlived the Great Master.[43] Other contemporary rulers to him were king Pradyota of Avantī and king Ajātaśatru of the kingdom of Magadha. But none of them arrested the attention of Sanskrit authors so much as Udayana has done. It was probably because of his romantic bent of mind and heroic deeds that he succeeded in winning some of the famous princesses of his times. We have to accept that the literary traditions cannot be dismissed as altogether baseless. They contain the elements of truth. Dr. Bhandarkar appears to have relied upon the historical value of these literary traditions.[44] It will not be out of place to refer to some of them.

---

39. *Durdaman according to Bhāgavata Purāṇa.*

40. *Matsya Purāṇa refers to him as Vahīnara.*

41. *If the Purāṇic Texts are believed he extended his suzerainty over the kingdom of Avantī, and, probably, also over the kingdom of Magadha. But this claim does not appear to be historically correct. Udayana might have extended his supremacy temporarily.*

42. *He is said to have been born on the same day on which Buddha was born.*

43. *We are told that Buddha's closest disciple Ānanda, persnally visited Kauśāmbī, the capital of Vatsas, and discussed with king Udayana some of the proceedings of the First Buddhist Saṅgīti that was convened at Rājagṛiha soon after Buddha's death. It was at this Council many charges were levelled against Ānanda. Vinaya Texts, translated and edited by Rhys Davids and Oldenberg, published in the Sacred Book of the East series, Oxford,* 1885, *Vol. XX, Part III, Pp.* 381*ff.*

44. *Dr. Bhandarkar, Lecturers on Ancient Indian History and Culture, Calcutta,* 1919, *Pp.* 58*ff.*

LITERARY TRADITIONS ASSOCIATED WITH UDAYANA

Many Buddhist[45] and Jain traditions[46] contain references to Udayana and his adventures. Before Harṣa chose him as his hero of his dramas, the Ratnāvalī and the Priyadarśikā, he (*Udayana*) was assigned that role in the famous works of Bhāsa, namely the Svapnavāsavadattā and the Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa.[47] Kauṭilya also makes a reference to Udayana.[48] Udayana and Vāsavadattā were also known to Patañjali.[49] Śūdraka refers to Udayana's success of coming out of captivity with the help of Yaugandharayaṇa.[50] Kālidāsa also refers to him in his Meghadūta refering to village elders of Avantī who are said to have been conversant with the story of Udayana.[51]

---

45. *Dhammapada Commentary, ed by H. C. Norman, London,* 1909, 1.2, 161-231*: E. W. Burlingame, Buddhist Legends, Harvard Oriental Series, Vol. XXVIII, Part I, Pp.* 247-293*; Majjhim Nikāya commentary entitled, Pañchasūdāni,* 3. 300-302*; Dalhadhamma Jātaka, ed. by V. Fausboll, Lond.,* 1883, 3. 384-385; *Vinaya Texts, Rhys Davids and Oldenberg, II, Pp.* 186-191.

46. *Like Buddhist traditions many Jain traditions also deserve mention. Kumārapālapratibodha of Somaprabha, ed. by Muni Jinvijayaji, Geakwad Oriental Series, Baroda, No.* 14, *Pp.* 76-83*; Trisatisatākāpuruṣa charita of Hemprabha and Mrigāvatī charita of Māldhāri contain Udayana legends.*

47 *Both these dramas are edited by Pandita T. Ganapati Śāstrī in his famous Trivandrum Sanskrit Series, Vols. XV and XVI. The Problem of authorship of these dramas has arrested the attention of famous Orientalists and Indologists Ind. Ant*, 1916, *Pp.* 188-195; *JRAS*, 1919, *Pp.* 233-4, *Ibid.*, 1921, *Pp.* 587-9;. *Ibid.*, 1922, *Pp.* 79-83.

48. दृष्टा हि जीवित. पुनरावृत्ति यथा सुमात्रोदयनाभ्याम्। *Book. IX, chapter VII, tr. and ed. by R. Samasastri, Mysore,* 1919, *P.* 360.

49. *Mahābhāṣya,* 2.313.

50. ज्ञातीन्.. उत्तेजयामि सुहृदः परिमोक्षणाय।
यौगन्धरायण इवोदयनस्य राज्ञः॥ —मृच्छकटिक, चतुर्थ अंक, श्लोक २६।
Ed. by Godbole and Parab, Bombay, 1896, *P.* 190; *Another edition by K. P. Parab, Bombay,* 1900, *P.* 113.

51. 'अवन्तीन् उदयनकथाकोविदग्रामवृद्धान्।' *Meghadūta, Part I, Stanza*

STORY OF UDAYANA IN KASHMĪRĪ TRADITIONS

Two famous works of Kashmīrī authors depict a graphic picture of the story of Udayana and Vāsavadattā. They are the Bṛihatkathāmañjarī of Kṣemendra[52] and Kathāsaritasāgara of Somadeva.[53] Both these works refer to Udayana legends with almost identical details.[54] To understand Harṣa's plots and his method of borrowing the story from the Udayana legends, we must know the story as told in these works.

According to them Udayana belonged to the famous line of the Pāṇḍavas.[55] Udayana was son of Sahasrānīka. His mother was queen Mṛigāvatī, who, while in pregnancy, was carried away by a bird and was left alone on the Udaya Parvata where she gave birth to Udayana at the hermitage of sage Jamadagni. One day, this boy freed a snake from the snake-charmer for a bracelet. The serpent, who was Vasunemi, the eldest brother of Vāsuki, the snake-chief, presented, as a token of his obligation, a lute called Ghoṣavatī. The latter possessed many supernatural

30. *ed. by Godbole and Parab, Second edition, p.* 24. *About his other adventures Kālidāsa also refers to in the Meghadūta,* 1.31*; Ibid., ed. and tr. Godbole and Parab, Pp.* 26 *and* 49.

52. *Bṛihatkathāmañjarī by Paṇḍit Shivadatta and Parab, Bombay,* 1901, *has been consulted in this article.*

53. *Kathāsaritasāgara, edited by Durga Prasad and Parab, Bombay,* 1889, *Translation by Tawney, Calcutta,* 1884.

54. *A slight variation is noticed in Kṣemendra's Bṛihatkathāmañjarī. It tells us of king Udayana being taken to Pātāla by a serpent. There he married a nāga maiden and received his famous Lute Ghoṣavatī. This story is related in Harṣa's Priyadarśikā along with Udayana's lute Ghoṣavatī and his adventurous trip to Pātāla where he learnt an art of counteracting the effect of posion. It may be recalled here that both Bṛihatkathāmañjarī and Kathāsaritasāgara owe their origin to Bṛihatkathā of Guṇāḍhya who is supposed have to flourished about the third century A.D.*

55. *We note one important difference in the story here. According to Purāṇic evidences Udayana was son of Śatānīka II whereas Kathāsaritasāgara refers to him as son of Sahasrānīka.*

and magical powers. In course of time the bracelet reached the king Sahasrānīka. As his name was inscribed on it, the king recognised it immediately and could get the knowledge of his wife and son. He left in search of them and found them at the āśrama. They all returned to Kauśāmbī. King Sahasrānīka consecrated Udayana as the crown prince. Vasantaka, Rumaṇvanta and Yaugandharāyaṇa were appointed as his counsellors. After some time, the king abdicated the throne in the favour of his son and the latter became the king of Kauśāmbī.

Udayana, soon after coming to throne, started his career as a pleasure-loving king. He was very much interested in wild animals, especially the elephants. They were tamed and trained by him with the help of his lute Ghoṣavatī.

He is said to be very keen to marry princess Vāsavadattā, the beautiful daughter of Chaṇḍamahāsena,[56] the king of Avantī, by his queen Aṅgrāvatī. This was not easy to be materialized because of existing rivalries between the two royal houses. The Avantī ruler was determined to crush the rising power of Kauśāmbī under Udayana; but wanted to avoid an open conflict. He knew Udayana's passion for hunting and successfully planned to exploit this weakness of Udayana. An artificial elephant of wood was constructed and was fixed up in the Vindhya forest bordering Udayana's territorial jurisdiction. This wooden elephant was also filled with soldiers. Chaṇḍamahāsena's strategy worked well and Udayana, who had come to tame the elephant with his Ghoṣavatī, was caught in this trap. He was captured and was taken to Ujjayinī where he was treated well by the king. The latter appointed him as a music teacher to teach his daughter Vāsavadattā in the music-room of the palace. When the news of Udayana's arrest reached Kauśāmbī, Yaugandharāyaṇa and Vasantaka left for Ujjayinī in order to work out the scheme to free their master. They reached there and entered the palace in disguise. They, however, revealed their identity to Udayana.

---

56. *Chaṇḍamahāsena is also known as Mahāsena or also as Pradyota in the Bṛihatkathāślokasaṁgraha.* (5.89-174) *and almost all Buddhist legends refer to him by this name.*

As the princess Vāsavadattā had already fallen in love with Udayana, the plan of escaping from the palace was made easy. Yaugandharāyaṇa worked out the details of the escape and Udayana fled with Vāsavadattā on her favourite elephant Bhadrāvatī. Vasantaka and Kāñchanamālā also left with them. As soon as the news disclosed, Chaṇḍmahāsena's son Pālaka immediately followed them on the elephant Naḍāgiri. As the latter did not attack his friend Bhadrāvatī, Pālaka felt helpless and was pursuaded by his brother Gopālaka to return.

Udayana and Vāsavadattā reached the Vindhya region where they met their trusted general Rumaṇvanta. They reached Kauśāmbī and the formal celebrations were made at the capital. Kathāsaritasāgara afterwards records two other love affairs of Udayana. One was with Virachitā, the female attendant of the palace and the other was with Bandhumatī, the princess in the captivity.[57] It was the timely intervention of Sāṁkṛityāyanī[58] that proved helpful in bringing about the reconciliation between Udayana and Vāsavadattā. This work then tells us of Udayana's marriage with Padmāvatī.[59]

SOME INCIDENTS OF UDAYANA'S LIFE AS FOUND IN THE BṚIHATKATHĀŚLOKASAṀGRAHA[60]

The story of Udayana and his achievements is not found in so many details in the Bṛihatkathāślokasaṁgraha as we find it in the works referred to above. But the former gives some information about some incidents and characters connected with them. An account of Udayana's birth and early life, his visit to Pātāla and his success in getting

57. *Her part in the story reminds us of Āraṇyakā in the Priyadarśikā of Harṣa or Sāgarikā in the Ratnāvalī.*

58. *Sāṁkṛityāyanī also plays a similar role in the Priyadarśikā.*

59. *A reference is also made to Padmāvatī and other queens in the Priyadarśikā.*

60. *This is another rendering of Bṛihatkathā of Guṇāḍhya. According to Winternitz, its author Buddhasvāmī is an idependent author of the work and wrote this work without borrowing any thing from Guṇāḍhya. But some scholars feel that he owes his story to Guṇāḍhya.*

Ghoṣavatī and acquiring the knowledge of taming elephants are given in almost identical ways. References to his two queens, namely Vāsavadattā and Padmāvatī and three other characters, namely Vasantaka, Yaugandharāyaṇa and Rumaṇvanta are also found in this work. We also learn about the Avantī king Mahāsena, his wife Aṅgrāvatī and elephants Bhadrāvatī and Naḍāgiri.

STORY AS ADOPTED BY BHĀSA

It has been already pointed out that the celebrated poet Bhāsa bases his two famous plays namely the Svapnavāsavadattā and Pratijñāyaugandharāyaṇa on the basis of details as known from the popular traditions. The first work of Bhāsa relates the strategy as it was worked out by king Mahāsena of Avantī. Some accounts therein are different from those we find in the Kashmīrī traditions.

Bhāsa does not say that Udayana was already keen to win Vāsavadattā's hand. Udayana was brought to Ujjayinī in wounded condition. He was kept as a captive. He acts as tutor to Vāsavadattā to teach her music. He tamed the elephant Naḍāgiri. Yaugandharāyaṇa also plays an important role in the story. The second drama, namely the Svapnavāsavadattā deals with the later period of Udayana's life.

THE STORY AS ADOPTED BY HARṢA

From the references to the story of Vatsarāja Udayana as found in various literary sources discussed above we get a clear picture of Harṣa's plots of the Priyadarśikā and the Ratnāvalī and their characters.

Vatsarāja Udayana as the hero and Vasantaka as the Vidūṣaka are given the main male roles. Similarly the queen Vāsavadattā is identically accompanied by her intimate maid Kāñchanamālā. Yaugandharāyaṇa and Rumaṇvanta are presented in both the dramas with a significant change. We have seen that literary sources refer to Yaugandharāyaṇa as an important and sincere minister who played a successful part in liberating his master; but he is referred to in the Ratnāvalī as a general. Rumaṇvanta, however, is assigned the role of a minister in the Priyadarśikā. In this play Yaugandharāyaṇa is only mentioned in the Mimic Play.

Among other characters Sāṁkṛityāyanī has a brief but an important place. Chaṇḍamahāsena, father of Vāsavadattā, is always referred to as Pradyota.[61] It is only in the Mimic Play he is called Mahāsena. Queen Aṅgarāvatī is brought to our notice when her letter proved helpful in disclosing the identity of Āraṇyakā. There is also a reference to Padmāvatī in the Priyadarśikā.

Thus, the main characters are almost the same as we find in the literary traditions and legends and, therefore, Harṣa's claim for originality can find some justification in his attempt to recast the story on a novel plan. In both the plays he acts independently, to a very great extent, in making the heroine the main centre of the plot. The Mimic Play in the Priyadarśikā, of course, has a close resemblance with the account found in the Kathāsaritasāgara. References to Ghoṣavatī and Vatsarāja's assignment as a music teacher are other points of resemblance. Vatsarāja's visit to Nāgaloka and his knowledge of poisons and an ability to counteract their effects also came from the original source.

With so many legends and literary traditions associated with the personality of Vatsarāja Udayana and his adventures, we cannot determine, with a definite degree, the main source of Harṣa on which the latter based his dramas. It appears that he might have read all legends and traditions or only a few of them and borrowed some points and could produce a better recast.

From these literary traditions, it appears that an original story of Udayana, as told in the Bṛihatkathā of Guṇāḍhya, who is supposed to have lived about the third century A.D., had been freely rendered by later writers. They reshaped it according to their own aḍoptations. Udayana might have been as popular in those days as Vikramāditya of Ujjayinī or Bhoja of Dhāra. It is, probably, therefore, because of this fact, Harṣa says in the Priyadarśikā and the Ratnāvalī that the story of Vatsarāja was a popular subject.[62]

---

61. *Bhāsa also refers to him as Pradyota.*

62. लोकेहारि च वत्सराजचरितम्, प्रियदर्शिका, अंक १, पृ० ६-७ । *Ratnāvalī, Act. I, P. 4.*

INFLUENCE OF KĀLIDĀSA[63] AND BHĀSA ON HARṢA'S WORKS

There are many instances available in the dramas of Harṣa which prove Kālidāsa's influence on Harsa's work. Harsa, who himself was an author, must have read Kālidāsa and because of this familiarity, it is natural for him to be influenced by Kālidāsa. The latter's drama Mālavikāgnimitra has cast its clear shadow upon the Priyadarśikā of Harsa. Shri R. V. Kṛishṇamachāriar has made a detailed study of the points of similarity and has dealt at these points in detail in his introduction to his edition of the Priyadarśikā.[64] The palace intrigues, heroine's participation in singing and dancing in the pre̤ksāgṛiha[65] present close similarities in both these dramas. The garden scene in the Mālavikāgnimitra[66] where the king and his friend Vidūsaka look at Mālavikā and her maid-servant concealingly finds many points of resemblance with the garden scene of the Ratnāvalī.[67] The consequent development of the story after king's love for Mālavikā was sensed by his queen, who angrily put Mālavikā into prison.[68] It finds its echo in the similar development of the plot in the Priyadarśikā.[69] The part played

---

63. *Many scholars make Kālidāsa contemporary to Chandragupta II; Vikramāditya. But these views have been emphatically refuted by Dr. R. B. Pandey. The learned scholar has proved, with great justification, that Kālidāsa flourished in the 1st century B. C. and was contemporary to Vikrama, the founder of the Vikrama Era, Dr. R. B. Pandey, Vikrama, The Founder of Vikrama Era, (Hindi Version),* *Pp.* 60-67.

64. *R. V. Kṛṣṇamāchariar, Priyadarśikā, Śrīraṅgaṁ,* 1906, *Pp. xlii-xlviii.*

65. *Both Kālidāsa and Harṣa select an identical term, in tis Prākṛit i.e. Pekkhāgāram or Pekkhāgarma, Priyadarśikā, Act.* 3; *Mālavikāgnimitra, Acts I and* 3.

66. *Mālavikāgnimitra, Act II.*

67. *Priyadarśikā, Act II.*

68. *Mālvikāgnimitra, Acts III and IV.*

69. *Priyadarśikā, Act III.*

by Kauśakī, a parivrājikā, who was intimately associated with the queen in the Mālavikāgnimitra reminds us of the similar role of a respectable lady named Sāṁkṛityāyanī in the Priyadarśikā. As Agnimitra's love-affair with Mālavikā and their secret meetings were innocently brought to the notice of the queen by the Vidūṣaka in his talk while asleep, it was under similar circumstances that Udayana's love intrigues were made known to the queen Vāsavadattā by the Vidūṣaka. These closely corresponding points make it clear that Harṣa was well acquainted with Kālidāsa's Mālavikāgnimitra.

Another drama of Kālidāsa that also presents some point of resemblance with that of Harṣa's Priyadarśikā is Vikramorvaśī, though not so close as those between the Priyadarśikā and the Mālavikāgnimitra.

The description of stone-seat in the garden-scene in the Virkamorvaśī, as narrated by the Vidūṣaka, appears closely similar to that of the Priyadarśikā.[70] The picture of the mid-day scene and its effect as felt by the peacocks and the bees in the Vikramorvaśī[71] remind us of the similar scene in the Priyadarśikā.[72]

The Third act of Vikramorvaśī[73] opens with a description of the state of mind of the heroine. It was her mistake that created difficulties by her faulty role she played due to an abnormal state of mind. In the Priyadarśikā, too, we find Āraṇyakā's poor performance in a role assigned to her. It was also due to her mental state of absentmindedness.[74] The role of the king both in the Priyadarśikā[75] and the Vikramorvaśī,[76] in tendering his apologies to angry and jealous queen offers identical expressions. Both these dramas define the duties of the chamberlain in a similar manner.[77]

---

70. *Vikramorvaśī, Act II; Priyadarśikā, Act II.*
71. *Last stanza o Act II.*
72. *Last stanza, Act I.*
73. *Vikramorvaśī, Act III, Explanatory Scene.*
74. *Priyadarśikā, Act III.*
75. *Priyadarśikā, Act IV, Stanzas 2 and 3.*
76. *Act 3, Stanza 13.*
77. *Priyadarśikā, Act 3, Stanza 3; Vikramorvaśī, Act 3, Stanza 1.*

Like the Vikramorvaśī and the Mālavikāgnimitra Kālidāsa's famous work Śākuntala also offers some examples of identical contents and descriptions. In the Priyadarśikā, we find an episode where Āraṇyakā was continuously tormented by the bees. In Śākuntala, too, we find the heroine similarly being disturbed by the bees.[78] Harṣa's reference to Śaphara fish[79] in the water of the pool reminds us of an identical example in the Meghadūta.[80]

Like Kālidāsa, Bhāsa, who was the first dramatist to select the Udayana legend for his dramas, must have also influenced the story and plot of Harsa's works. Some incidents in Bhāsa's dramas lead us to come to such conclusion. As he himself was a dramatist, it is likely that he might have studied the dramas of Bhāsa, Kālidāsa and many of his other predecessors.

Unlike the Priyadarśikā and the Ratnāvalī, Harṣa's third drama, the Nāgānanda, is not claimed to have been based upon an original theme. The Nāgānanda is said to have been adorned with (*alaṁkṛitā*) an original arrangement (*apūrva Vasturachanā*) of the plot. But Harṣa does not make such a claim about the story of this drama. On the other hand, he says that it dealt with the story of the Vidyādhara Jātaka (*Vidyādharajātakapratinibadhaṁ*). Like the story of his two other dramas, the story of Jīmūtavāhan is also found in the Bṛihatkathā of Guṇāḍhya. Later, it was incorporated in the Bṛihatkathāmañjarī of Ksemendra and *Kathāsaritasāgara* of Somadeva. It is also found in the Vetālapañchavinśati.[81]

CHRONOLOGY OF HARṢA'S PLAYS

By chronology, I mean here the order of the composition of the dramas assigned to Harṣa. At the very outset we must confess that we

---

78. *Priyadarśikā, Act 2, Pp.* 30-31, *Śākuntala, Act* 1.

79. *Priyadarśikā, Act* 1, *Last Stanza, Last line.* आमात्यकीशुताप-क्वयदिन शफरोद्वर्तनदीर्घिकाम्भः।

80. *Meghadūta,* 1.40.

81. *A. B. Keith, The Sanskrit Drama, P.* 174.

cannot say anything definitely and conclusively on this point, but some working arrangement can be obtained on the basis of a comparative study of the plot, style and theme of the dramas. With its simple style, plot and general set-up the Priyadarśikā appears to be the first work of Harṣa. The question of determining the order of the two other works, however, is not so easy and simple. Both the works are superior to the first work and, therefore, opinions are at variance about their order of composition. Of these two the Ratnāvalī surpasses the Nāgānandaṁ in literary beauty and elaborate plot. Some scholars, on this basis, assign second place to the Nāgānandaṁ.[82] But such a conclusion does not reconcile with the personal history of Harṣa's life. We know it for certain that Harṣa entertained Buddhist ideals in the later part of his life and as the Nāgānandaṁ presents its author's Buddhistic inclinations, it must have been his last work. Thus the Ratnāvalī is to be assigned the second place and the Nāgānandaṁ, therefore, should be treated as his third work.

HARṢA'S LANGUAGE

We have seen in these dramas that Harṣa's characters do not speak one and the same language. The sūtradhāra *(stage-manager)* and the male characters, except a few ones, use fine and literary form of Sanskrit. Other characters speak Prākṛit. The latter is Śūrasenī with Mahārāṣṭrī in verses.[83] An example of the use of Māghadhī is also found in the Nāgānandaṁ. A servant speaks this language.[84] Literary critics opine that Sanskrit used by Harsa is of "the usual classical type" and his knowledge of Prākṛit is "commendable."[85] The variation of forms in the Northern and Southern editions is also noteworthy.[86]

---

82. *Nāgānandaṁ, ed. Brahme and Paranjape, P. X.*
83. *Keith, Sanskrit Drama, P.* 181*; Priyadarśikā, Pp. xcl-xcv.*
84. *I owe this information to A. B. Keith. Ibid., P.* 181.
85. *Ibid., P.* 181.
86. *JRAS.,* 1921, *P.* 589, *cited in Sanskrit Drama, P.* 181.

SECTION C

THE LITERARY CIRCLE AT THE COURT OF HARṢA

The history of India in ancient and medieval periods offers several examples of the poets and writers who received liberal royal patronage. It was regarded as one of the royal duties to offer generous patronage to the men of letters and art. Kings and rulers were always desirous of the association with authors and writers. Kālidāsa, Bhavabhūti, Bhāsa, Dhāvaka, Dhanañjaya, Bāṇa, Mayūra and others are among those literary figures who received the royal patronage. There are many such examples of royal patronage extended to the men of letters at European courts also. We find ministrels, trouvers and gleemen who were professional poets and received continuous royal patronage. Queen Elizabeth I of England was the patron of Shakespeare, Spenser and Sir Philip Sidney. Lious the XIV of France offered his generous patronage to Acine Corneille and Moliere. Tennyson and others won the recognition and encouragement at the court of queen Victoria.

It is universally accepted that Harsa was a liberal patron of the men of letters and art. He donated one fourth of his revenue for "rewarding high intellectual eminence."[1] On the basis of undisputable evidences we know that Bāṇa, Mayūra and Mātaṅga, Divākara and others adorned his court.[2] In addition to this distinguished circle there were many other gifted authors, thinkers and philosophers who flourished during the age of Harṣa and received the imperial favours.[3] Bāna informs us about the presence of court-poets at the palace of Harsa's father also. He says that "the court-poets had laid aside their glee"[4] during the period of Prabhākaravardhana's sickness. We shall now propose to discuss the lives and achievements of some of these men of letters.

---

1. *Watters, Vol. I, p.* 176; *THK., P.* 175.
2. *THK., Pp.* 178-179.
3. *THK., Pp.* 175-178.
4. *HCCTH., P.* 138.

BĀṆA

Bāṇa is one of the brightest stars in the firmament of the Sanskrit world. He ranks among a few great Sanskrit authors and his place as the master of Sanskrit language is remarkably unique. To quote late Mr. F. W. Thomas, he was "the greatest master of Sanskrit language."[5] Only those, who have gone through the pages of Harṣacharita and Kādambarī in original, can estimate his unrivalled mastery over Sanskrit language and literature and his knowledge about Indian history, culture, philosophy, religious and social institutions is also remarkable.

Our sources of information regarding the personal lives and works of Sanskrit authors are very meagre. We do not know anything "definite" and "historic", based on unimpeachable facts, even about Kālidāsa, except some fanciful and confusing accounts. There are a few Sanskrit authors who have left for posterity the details of their lives and works. But we are fortunate enough to possess a good deal of autobiographical accounts of the life of Bāṇa. Both in the Kādambarī and the Harṣacharita we find the complete history of Bāṇa's ancestors and that of his own life. On the basis of these sources we are in a postition to construct the genealogy of Bāṇa's family.

The progenitor of Bāṇa's family was Vatsa who lived in the village called Prītikūṭa on the western bank of the river Śoṇa.[6] This is why his family came to be known as Vātsāyana. In this family there was born a learned Paṇḍita, named Kubera, who was a scholar of great repute and was well-versed in the Vedas. He had four sons. Among these four sons, Paśupati won distinctions. He had a son, named Arthapati, who was the father of eleven sons. The eighth of them was Chitrabhānu, who was Bāṇa's father. Bāṇa's mother Rājadevī died when he was an infant, but Chitrabhānu brought up Bāṇa as affectionately and lovingly as his (Bāṇa's)

5. *Legacy of India, p.* 206.

6. *According to some scholars Bāṇa's home was near modern Śonabhadra in the Gayā District and nearly fourteen miles west from Rafīganj. Dr. V. S. Agrwal, Harṣacharita : Eka Sāṁskṛitika Addhyayana, Patna,* 1953, *Pp.* 18-19; *Mādhurī, Vol. VIII, No.* 96, *V. S.* 1987, *Pp.* 722-727.

mother could have done. His father's tender affection and dutiful guardianship are picturesquely depicted in the Harṣacharita. His father educated him and "performed all the necessary infantine saṁsakāras" according to the Dharmaśāstras. But this tender affection was snatched away from his life when Bāṇa was only fourteen. When his father died, Bāṇa was left in his tender teens with none to look after him. In the absence of any proper guardianship, at such an impressionable age of his life, Bāṇa's character was spoiled and he led an itinerant and way-ward life. During his wanderings he came into contact with various types of people and gained wide experience, knowledge and wisdom. After these wanderings were over, he returned homewards and began to live at Prītikūṭa.

After enjoying the court life he came back to his native place where he won the warmest reception from his kinsmen and friends. The youngest cousion of Bāṇa, named Śyāmala, requested Bāṇa to relate the story of the life and achievements of Harsavardhana. Here at this point we come to an end of the autobiographical record of Bāṇa. Unfortunately we find no further details about his later life. We know, however, from the pen of his son, Bhūṣaṇabhaṭṭa in his introduction to the later part (Uttarabhāga) of the Kādambarī that his father Bāṇa died leaving his kāvya unfinished.

THE DATE OF BĀṆA

Though Bāṇa himself left no chronological record of his life, we are on some surer grounds about his times. He is the only one of the few great Sanskrit authors about whom we can tell something historic and definite. We possess contemporaneous records of Yuan Chuang and Bāṇa about Harṣa, which, though not strictly synchronous, enable us to conclude that Harṣa of Sthāṇvīśvara as referred to in the Harṣacharita of Bāṇa and Harṣavardhana of Kanauj as referred to in the accounts of Yuan Chuang are one and the same person. It is, however, strange to note that the pilgrim and the poet are silent about each other. It seems that either Bāṇa might have retired to his native home or might have died before the visit of Yuan Chuang. From Bāṇa's accounts of Harṣa's early life it can safely be concluded that Bāṇa must have flourished between the later half of the sixth and the first half of the seventh century A.D..

BĀṆA'S WORKS

It is well known that Harṣacharita and Kādambarī are the two creations of Bāṇa. Of the prose works they are the most outstanding masterpieces. In addition to these some other works are also assigned to him. The Chaṇḍīśataka, a collection of one hundred verses in honour of goddess Chaṇḍī or Durgā is the third work attributed to Bāṇa's authorship.[7] Arjunavarmadeva also ascribes the authorship of this work to Bāṇa in his commentary on Amaruśataka.[8]

But some scholars "hesitate to assert that Bāṇa was the author of Chaṇḍīśataka.[9] In Kādambarī we find a powerful and picturesque description of the temple of Chaṇḍikā and her praise by Bāṇa.[10] He mentions the goddess as Durgā. This similarity of descriptions and almost identical appreciation lead us to conclude that Bāṇa must have written Chaṇḍīśataka.

The Pārvatīpariṇaya, a drama of ordinary skill, is also ascribed to Bāṇa, who in the prelude claims to be its author. It is said therein that the drama was composed by Bāṇa of the line (*gotra*) of Vatsa.[11]

The subject of this drama has close similarity with that of Kumārsaṁbhava of Kālidāsa, and there are also some remarkable coincidences in the theme and some linguistic similarities. On this ground some scholars maintain that Pārvatīpariṇaya is a plagiarised creation ascribing this plagiarism to Bāṇa. This presumption has no substantial basis as we know from the Harṣacharita that Bāṇa was the admirer and appreciator of the fine verses of Kālidāsa.[12] And when the subject is the same, it is quite

---

7. *Peterson, Kd., Pp.* 96-98; *The Subhāṣitāvalī, Bombay*, 1896, *Pp.* 62-66.

8. *The Harṣacharita of Bāṇabhaṭṭa, Ed. P. V. Kane, First Ed., Bombay,* 1918, *Intro, P. XVII.*

9. *Those who hesitate to assign Chaṇḍīśataka to Bāṇa, they do so on the ground that some verses from Chaṇḍīśataka occur in the Sarasvatīkaṇṭhābharaṇa in the Kāvyaprakāśa. Mr. Kane does not approve these arguments. Ibid.,* 1918, *P. XVIII.*

10. *Kādambarī by Bāṇa, Ed. Parab, Bombay, Pp.* 455-59.

11. *Pārvatīpariṇaya,* 1.4.

12. *Harṣacharita, Can. I, Verse* 16.

41

natural that Bāṇa would have imitated his favourite writer in theme and expression. In the works of Kālidāsa many expressions from the Mahābhārata and the Bhagvadgītā are taken.[13] But on that basis we can not assign the works of Kālidāsa to Vyāsa or Lord Kṛiṣṇa. When one makes a thorough study of a particular author it is quite natural for him to imitate unconsciously or consciously the style and phraseology of his favourite author. To my humble mind it seems that this drama was written by Bāṇa in the beginning of his career as an author. It was during his later life that Bāṇa attained the mastery and maturity as the greatest master of Sanskrit language. At the same time Bāṇa does not excel as much in verse as he does in prose. There is one more drama 'Mukuṭatāḍitaka' which is also assigned to Bāṇa, but like Pārvatīpariṇaya it also faces the controversy about its authorship; Chaṇḍapāla and Guṇavinayagani, the commentators on the Nalachampū of Trivikramabhaṭṭa inform us that Bāṇa wrote a drama entitled 'Mukuṭatāḍitaka.'[14] We, however, do not possess any further evidence to corroborate Bāṇa's authorship of this drama. Prof. Peterson also draws our attention to a fact that Kṣemendra quoted a verse of Bāṇa's Subhāṣitāvalī in his Auchityavichāracharchā with a statement that it was part of the description of Kādambarī's sorrow in the absence of Chandrapīḍa. The learned scholar adds in his supposition that Bāṇa wrote the story of Kādambarī in verse as well as in prose and he quotes some verses which might have been taken from such a writing.[15] Before analysing Bāṇa's personality and his literary beauty we must note two salient qualities of his personality.

Firstly, he was a man of sharp intelligence and had the capacity

---

13. *The Harṣacharita of Bāṇabhaṭṭa, Ed. P. V. Kane, First Ed., Bombay,* 1918, *P. XVII.*

14. "यदाह मुकुटताडितकनाटके "बाण: आशा: प्रोषितदिग्गजा इव गुहा: प्रध्वस्तसिंहा इव द्रोण्य: कृत्तमहाद्रुमा इव भुव: प्रोत्खातशैला इव। बिभ्राणा:क्षयकालरिक्तसकलत्रलोक्यकष्टां दशां जाता: क्षीणमहारथा: कुरुपतेर्देवस्य शून्या: सभा:॥"
HCK., Intro. P. xviii.

15. *Peterson, Kādambarī, Pp.* 96-98; *The Subhāṣitāvalī, Ed. Peterson, Bombay,* 1886, *Pp.* 62-66.

to learn everything quickly. His knowledge was wide and his vision broad.

Secondly, his appetite for learning was extraordinary. He was always anxious to learn and whatever he learnt he remembered it for ever. These two qualities combined with wide personal experience of the world made him a man of encylopaedic learning.

He visited many towns and cities and lived in the company of all sorts of people. He minutely observed the etiquettes of the court and lived both at the huts and the palaces; he learnt at the Gurukulas as well as at the houses of gamblers, dancers and all sorts of men and women who came in his contact.

LITERARY ESTIMATE OF BĀṆA'S WORKS

The Harṣacharita is the first work to win distinction to its creator. Our appreciation of it is deepened when we rememebr that it is the first attempt at writing a prose Kāvya based on historical background.[16] The author selects his own patron as his hero and constructs the story out of some actual events of his early life. This work is the most important work to throw light on Indian society and culture during the age of Harṣa. But we have to confess that there is limited scope for historical survey in this "lavishly embellished" and "gorgeously descriptive" account. The Harṣacharita begins with the mythological genealogy of Bāṇa's family until we come to his own birth and education. He spent some early years of his life in travelling around the various parts of the country. Afterwards he returned to his native village. After a few days he was summoned to the court of Harṣa where he lived for a long time. He relates the story of Harṣacharita to his cousins. The brief summary of the story runs as follows.

Prabhākaravardhana was the king of Sthāṇavīśvara. He was renowned for his valour and several glorious achievements. By his queen Yaśomatī, he had two sons, namely Rājyavardhana and Harṣavardhana and a daughter named Rājyaśrī. In due course Rājyaśrī was given in marriage to king Grahavarman of Kānyakubja.

---

16. *Dr. S. N. Dasgupta and S. K. De, A History of Sanskrit Literature, Calcutta*, 1947, *Vol. I, Pp.* 227-8.

Prabhākaravardhana died while Rājyavardhana had been on an expedition against the Hūṇas. He returned and resolved to become an ascetic. At this juncture a messenger from Kānyakubja informed about the treacherous murder of Grahavarman and Rājyaśrī's imprisonment. Rājyavardhana marched with his cousin Bhaṇḍī to avenge the death of Grahavarman. He conquered the Mālvā army, but was deceitfully assassinated by the king of Gauḍa. Now it was left for Harṣa to punish these enemies. He marched immediately with his army to Kānyakubja.

On his way he met Bhaṇḍī who informed that Rājyaśrī had escaped from the prison and had fled to the Vindhya forest. Thereupon Harṣa deputed Bhaṇḍī against the Gauḍa king and went himself in search of his sister. With the help of Divākaramitra, a Buddhist mendicant, he found his sister and brought her back to the camp. Here at this point Bāṇa closes his work abruptly depriving us of some of the most valuable informations. But we must remember that Bāṇa was not writing history. One must agree with Dr. Dasgupta who maintains that Bāṇa wrote his Harṣacharita "more as a romantic story than as a sober history" of the life of his patron and stopped when he felt that "his muse had taken a sufficiently long flight."[17]

Bāṇa's other work Kādambarī is an entirely imaginative creation. Like the Harṣacharita it was also left incomplete. It was, however, his death which barred the completion of the work. The later part of Kādambarī was completed by Bāṇa's son, Bhūṣaṇabhaṭṭa. We cannot determine in what way Bāṇa would have completed his work; but the comparative inferiority of the later part is universally accepted. A reader is bound to be impressed by the introductory complexities of the plot. The son possessed some of the excellent qualities of his father, but he failed to complete the remaining portion with the same skill and grandeur. Bāṇa begins his story of the Kādambarī introducing a chāṇḍāla maiden at the court of king Śūdraka. She had come to the court with a parrot named Vaiśampāyana in whose mouth the entire narrative is put. The story is

17. *Ibid.*, *I*, P. 228.

fantastically complex and long and space does not permit me to narrate here that lengthy tale.

Bāṇa is famous for his complexity of plot and for his effectiveness of constructive power. But the learned authors of the History of Sanskrit literature are justified when they say that "like Spenser, Bāṇa conceived of too large a plan and never lived to finish it."[18] He is often criticized for "his weakness for elaborating the tales by dwelling too much on details in a style which draws prose and poetry together in an unnatural alliance." But his power of observation and picturesque description, his richness for fancy and wealth of words and his command over Sanskrit language are unquestionably and universally appreciated."[19]

MAYŪRA

Our knowledge about Mayūra and his works is insufficient and meagre. Legends and traditions associate him with Bāṇabhaṭṭa as a literary rival. He is also said to have been related to Bāṇa as brother-in-law, or father-in-law. This matrimonial alliance of Mayūra with Bāṇa, however, is not accepted as a fact based on historical evidences and has been challenged by Dr. A. Venkatasubbiah who regards such legends assertions of the commentators and various traditions recorded by a number of anthologists as untrustworthy and unacceptable.[20]

Mr. Peterson says that the reference to Mayūra in Bāṇa's Harṣacharita seems to be erroneous; for Mayūra, who is mentioned as Bāṇa's contemporary and friend, was a Jāṅgūlika i. e. one who cured snake-bites.[21] It appears that Mr. Peterson has confused Mayūraka with Mayūra.[22] We learn from the Harṣacharita that the Jāṅgūlika was named Mayūraka. Even if we accept Peterson's opinion that Mayūra, the poet, was a Jāṅgūlika we have no reason to disapprove his claim of being a poet.

---

18. *Ibid.*, P. 230.
19. *Ibid.*, *Pp.* 232-33.
20. *JORM.*, *Vol. IX*, *Pp.* 81-82.
21. *Peterson's Intro. to the Subhāṣitāvalī.*, P. 86.
22. *HCCTH.*, P. 33; *HCK.*, P. 19.

It is said that Mayūra had been afflicted with leprosy by the curse of Bāṇa's wife, who was either Mayūra's sister or daughter. She cursed him because of her anger caused by the description of her beauty by Mayūra in his work Mayūraśataka.[23] The traditions and legends further record that he was cured from this serious disease by the grace of the god Sun in whose honour and glorifying commendation he composed Sūryaśataka, an anthology of one hundred verses.[24] This Stotraśataka of Mayūra consists of praise and glorification of the Sun-incarnate. Therein we find a vivid picture of his chariot, the horses, the charioteer and other belongings. The legend of the cure of his leprosy seems to have been originated from the sixth stanza wherein the Sun is said to have possessed the power of curing ills. Critics opine that Sūryaśataka "possesses compound words, difficult construction, constant alliteration, jingling of syllables and other rhetorical devices with an elaborate diction."[25] This creation of Sūryaśataka caused jealousy in Bāṇa's mind who is said to have composed Chaṇḍīśataka in praise of Durgā to prove his greater excellence than Mayūra.[26]

Besides Mayūraśataka and Sūryaśataka, a Khaṇḍapraśasti of Mayūra is cited by Ruyyaka in his "Alaṅkārasarvasva" The Kośa is also attributed to him which is mentioned by Burnell in his "Classified Index to the Sanskrit Manuscripts in the Palace Library at Tanjore."[27] A work on prosody by Mayūra is alluded to him by the Kannada author Nāgavarman (c. 1040 A.D.) in his Chaṇḍombudhi and also in his Abhidhāna-

---

23. *G. P. Quackenbos, The Sanskrit Poems of Mayūra, Columbia University Series, Vol. IX, New York*, 1917, *Pp.* 72-79. *JAOS., Vol. XXX, Pp.* 343-54; *THK., P.* 179; *HSL., I, P.*, 168.

24. *Some scholars maintain that the "Sūryaśataka and Mayūraśataka are not two separate works but they are simply two different names of one and the same text". THK., P.* 179; *JBHU., Vol. I, No.* 2, *P.* 235; *but this view is now admittedly wrong.*

25. *HSL., I, Pp.* 169-170.

26. *Ibid., P.* 170; *G. S. Chatterjee, Harṣavardhana, P.* 232.

27. *JORM., Vol. IX, P.* 82.

Vastu-Kośa.[28] Āryamuktāmālā is also assigned to Mayūra of which a copy is known to have existed in a private library of Sūrat.[29]

DIVĀKARA

Another contemporary poet to Bāṇa and Mayūra was Mātaṅga-Divākara. As stated by Rājaśekhara, this poet had become a member of the literary circle of Śrī-Harṣa "on equal terms with Bāṇa and Mayūra."[30] Dr. Kane refers to the commentators of the Bhaktāmarastotra of Jain Mānatuṅgāchārya who maintain that Mānatuṅga (Mātaṅga) "lived at the court of Bhoja at Ujjayinī and was a contemporary of Bāṇa and Mayūra."[31] But these accounts are chronologically baseless and have no historic basis at all. According to Dr. Keith, some of his poems are still preserved,[32] and he must have been a renowned poet. Dr. R. S. Tripathi rightly concludes that "his literary excellences and achievements must have sufficed to win him royal recognition and favour."[33]

---

28. *Ibid., Vol. IX, P.* 82.

29. *Bühler's Catalogue of Sanskrit Manuscripts in Gujrat, Vol. II, P.* 72. *Cited in Pannikar's Shri Harṣa of Kanauj, P.* 75.

30. अहो प्रभावो वाग्देव्या यन्मातंगदिवाकरः ।
श्रीहर्षस्याभवत्सभ्यः समो बाणमयूरयोः ॥
cited in THK., P. 179.

31. *HCK., Intro., P. V.*

32. *Keith, Classical Sanskrit Literature, P.* 120., *quoted by Dr. R. S. Tripathi, THK., P.* 180.

33. *Ibid., Pp.* 179-80.

CHAPTFR IX

THE SOCIETY

BACKGROUND

The Varṇāśramavyavasthā has worked as an indispensable and inseparable corner-stone in the magnificient edifice of the Hindu social structure. It is universally accepted as one of the most distinctive and outstanding characteristics of the Hindu Society, and is, perhaps, without any adequate parallel in the annals of whole human history.[1] The very expression of the 'Varṇāśramadharma' is a significant and meaningfully true synonym for Hinduism and it has worked as a basic factor in the systematization of the Hindu way of life. It is the strongest basis of our

---

1. *Ludwing and Senart maintain that Iranian Society was also divided into four classes (Pistras) which significantly correspond to our Varṇās. According to them Athrasvas (Priests), the Rathaesthas (Warriors), the Vastriyas Fshouyants (family chiefs) and the Huitis (labourers) of the earliest Iranian society respectively correspond to the Brāhmaṇas, the Kṣatriyas, the Vaiśyas and the Sūdras of the Hindu Society. R. C. Majumdar, Corporate Life in Ancient India, Pp.* 143-144. *Dr. Majumdar regards this correspondence correct; but the conclusion of the learned scholar is not based on conclusive and satisfactory arguments. The varṇas of our society are based on the unique and special character. They, in fact, cannot be identified with any other social structure of the world. Certain scholars and sociologists have also pointed out that the social classes similar to the varṇas were in existence in European Society. L. F. Ward's article : "Social Classes and Sociological Theory" in American Journal of Sociology, Vol. VII, Pp.* 617-627. *cf. Ralph Lincoln. The Study of Men, Pp.* 127-28. *To me it seems that these statements are not wholly correct. The notable uniqueness of our social order as based on Varṇa and Āśrama makes it originally and fully Indian. Comparisons and Parallels are always there, but our Varṇāśramavyavasthā is typically ours.*

social organization and has played a notable role in the preservation, exposition, continuation and popularization of our social, cultural, philosophical, moral, aesthetical, religious and spiritual values of life. From Kashmīr to Kanyākumārī and from Kāmrūpa to Gujrāt the predominance of the Varṇāśramadharma has remained, generally speaking, undisturbed and unchanged throughout the ages.

COMPOSITION OF THE SOCIETY DURING THE AGE OF HARṢA VARṆĀŚHRAMA : THE BASIS OF SOCIAL ORDER

The period under review witnessed the ascendancy of Varṇāśramadharma. The revival of Hinduism, which had taken place under the Imperial Guptas, was completely accomplished in the sixth and seventh centuries A.D.. Another outstanding feature of this period is that Hinduism gradually and steadily displaced Buddhism, which could never regain the predominance it enjoyed under Aśoka and Kaniṣka. Thus the strongest challenge to Varṇāśramadharma was silenced completely.

EPIGRAPHIC EVIDENCE

All the epigraphic sources that have been discovered so far provide with enough evidence which clearly proves that the Varṇāśramadharma was founded on solid grounds. Paramabhaṭṭāraka Mahārājādhirāja Prabhākaravardhana[2] is said to be "the strong supporter of Varṇāśrama order."[3] Several other grants of this period refer to the kings and rulers who are invariably said to have been "constantly busy in regulating proper functioning of all the varṇas and the āśramas."[4] It is in accordance with

2. *Panniker wrongly tells us that the epithet is ascribed to Harṣa's grandfather (Sri Harṣa of Kanauj, P.* 38). *'Varṇāśramavyavasthāpanpravṛiattaḥ' stands for Prabhākaravardhana and not for Ādityavardhan. Sonapat Copper Seal, CII., Vol. III, No.* 52, *Plate XXXIIB, P.* 232; *Nālandā Seals, Ep. Ind., Vol. XXI,* 1931-32, *P. 74, Line 5; Madhubana Grant, Ibid., Vol. I, Pp.* 67*ff; Bānskherā Grant, Ibid., Vol. IV., Pp.* 208*ff.*

3. *In all the family records this epithet is assigned to Prabhākaravardhana.*

4. *As almost all the inscriptions of this period record such information, it is not possible to refer to them all.*

the rules laid down by the writers on ancient Indian social and cultural institutions. It was regarded as one of the main duties of a Hindu monarch to look after the observance of the duties and obligations of the people of all varṇas according to laws and customs of the varṇas and the āśramas. He was never expected to allow the people to swerve from their duties.[5]

TESTIMONY OF YUAN CHUANG

The Chinese pilgrim Yuan Chuang who visited India and stayed here for nearly fifteen years made on-the-sopt survey of social and political conditions. He writes, "There are four orders of hereditary class distinctions."[6] These four orders consisted of the Brāhmaṇas, or "purely living people," the Kṣatriyas, "the race of the kings," the Vaiśyas or "a class of traders" and the Śūdras.[7]

LITERARY EVIDENCE

Bāṇa in his Harṣacharita characterises Harṣa as one who "carried out all the rules for the Varṇas and the Āśramas lik· Manu."[8] While speaking about the social and cultural life and the prosperity of the land of Śrīkaṇṭha Janapada, he says that "the laws of the Varṇas were for ever unconfounded."[9] Throughout the pages of Bāṇa's works,[10] Harṣa's dramas and the works of his other contemporary authors we get the picture of society which was definitely divided into the four Varṇas.

---

5. *Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra, tr. R. Shamasastry, Fourth Ed.*, 1951, *Mysore, Book I, Chap. III.*

6. *Watters, Vol. I, P.* 168. *According to Watters, the particulars given by Yuan Chuang about the division of the people in the four classes are "rendered loosely." Ibid., I, P.* 168.

7. *Ibid., I, P.* 168.

8. *HCCTH., P.* 66 मनाविव कर्तरि वर्णाश्रमव्यवस्थाना–ह॰च॰, द्वि॰ उ॰, पृ॰ ३६।

9. *HCCTH., P.* 79. 'सततमसंकीर्णवर्णव्यवहारस्थिति:'–ह॰च॰, तृ॰ उ॰, पृ॰ ४२।

10. *The Harṣacharita and Kādambari are commonly known to be the works of Bāṇa. But there are other works also about which the reference will be made later.*

THE BRĀHMAṆAS

The Brāhmaṇas enjoyed a very high and respectful position in the society. They were universally honoured for their high standard of purity, learning and religiously enhanced social status. They were the most exalted citizens among all.

This period is marked with two main currents. Firstly, the glorification of gifts to the Brāhmaṇas by other three Varṇas became a distinct feature of Hinduism. This was largely the contribution of this period.[11] By gifts Manu unequivocally means gifts to the Brāhmaṇas. He says that it was the supreme duty of man in the Kali age.[12] Almost all inscriptions and literary works of this period testify to the fact that it was not a mere wish of the Brāhmaṇas, but a living reality acted upon by the contemporary men and women.[13] The people in those times firmly believed that feeding the Brāhmaṇas was one of the acknowledged means of gaining godly favours and religious merit.[14] They performed the Svastivāchana[15] rite and received gifts. Harṣa's drama and Bāṇa's works contain several such examples.[16] The Brāhmaṇas received both gifts and respect at the royal courts.[17]

Several grants were made to the Brāhmaṇas and their number is so large that it is not possible to refer to them. Harṣa's two grants were also made to Brāhmaṇas. Harṣa is said to have donated to the Brāhmaṇas a

---

11. *Dr. G. S. Churve, Caste and Class in India, Bombay*, 1950, *Pp*. 91-2.

12. *Manusmṛiti*. 86.

13. *R. G. Bhandarkar, A Peep Into the Early Hist. of India, P*. 53; *Chakaldar, Studies in Vātsyāyan's Kāmasūtra, Pp*. 98-99.

14. *HCCTH., P*. 164.

15. *Svastivāchana denotes the enchantment of benedictory hymns by Brāhmaṇas at religious ceremonies and rites. The Brāhmaṇas got gifts and other complimentary presents at such occasions. Monier William's Dictionary, P*. 1283.

16. *Priyadarśikā, Act II, P*. 21; *Ratnāvali, Act* 2; *HCCTH., P*. 65; *HCK., Can*. 2, *P*. 35; *Kādambarī, tr. Ridding, P*. 55.

17. *Ibid., P*. 55; *Priyadarśikā, Act II, P*. 21; *Ratnāvalī, Act II; HCCTH., Pp. 65ff; HCK., Can*. 2, *P*. 35; *Kādambarī, P*. 55.

hundred villages, 'delimited by a thousand ploughs' on the eve of his departure for the Digvijaya (world-conquest).[18] All the personal belongings of the deceased king Prabhākaravardhana were given to the Brāhmaṇas.[19] They also 'consumed the departed spirit's first oblation.'[20] Their place in society was indispensable as priests, purohitas and preceptors. All important religious ceremonies of all types beginning from the cradle to grave were performed by a purohita who received gifts and donations for his religious performances. Literary and epigraphic sources at our disposal provide us with a number of instances of these ceremonial rites.

But this was not merely by virtue of their being Brāhmaṇas. Their social status was based on their high learning and religious life. All the sources of this period lead us to the conclusion that the supremacy of the Brāhmaṇas was based on their deep learning and righteous conduct.

According to Yuan Chuang, they were "purely living" people.[21] The Chinese pilgrim tells us that "they (Brāhmaṇas) keep their principles and live continently, strictly observing ceremonial purity."[22] At another place he writes, "Among the various castes and classes of the country the Brāhmaṇas were the purest," and they were "highly esteemed." It was for their excellent reputation that the name "Brāhmaṇa-country" (P'o-lo-men-kuo) became a "popular one for India" among the Chinese people.[23] The pilgrim was highly impressed by their devotion to learning. He met one Brāhmaṇa who was "super-abundant in reasoning and eminent in

---

18. *HCCTH.*, *p.* 199 महानिमित्त तत्सीरसहस्रसंमितसीम्नां ग्रामाणं शतमदाद्द्विजेभ्यः। —ह० च०, स० उ०, पृ० ५४।

19. *Ibid.*, *p.* 164. दीयमाने द्विजेभ्यः शयनासनचामरातपत्रमत्रपत्रशस्त्रादिके-नपनिकटोपकरणकलापे, —ह० च०, ष० उ०, पृ० ३६।

20. *HCCTH.*, *p.* 164; प्रथमप्रेतपिण्डभुजि भुक्ते द्विजन्मति।

—ह० च०, ष० उ०, पृ० ३६।

21. *Watters, I., P.* 168.

22. *Ibid., I, P.* 168.

23. *Ibid., I. P.* 140. *This name was a foreign designation and used by the Chinese specially. For Watter's remark, Vol. I, P.* 140.

the Vedas and other śāstras."[24] With this account of the Chinese pilgrim the views of Bāṇa do not appear to have been exaggerated when he uses the epithet "Brāhmamukhāḥ"[25] for the Brāhmaṇas "who had the Vedas on their lips."[26] For the Brāhmaṇas it was absolutely necessary to learn the Vedas by heart. In the Nāgānandaṁ the Vidūṣaka is asked by Cheṭī to repeat the Vedic hymns to prove that he was a Brāhmaṇa.[27] In the Priyadarśikā the king says to the Vidūṣaka that the qualities of a Brāhmaṇa are known by the number of the Vedas he knows.[28]

Sometimes the Brāhmaṇas were known after the particular Veda on which they attained the mastery. The Banskhera grant was issued to Bhaṭṭa Bālachandra and Bhaṭṭa Bhadrasvāmī.[29] The former was a Ṛigvedin Brāhmaṇa whereas the latter was a Sāmavedin Brāhmaṇa.[30] Similar epithets are also ascribed to the donees of the Madhubana grant.[31] These epithets in these and several other grants, most probably, denote their mastery of the respective Vedas. The faces of the cousins of Bāṇa are said to have been "made pure by the study of the Vedas."[32] Bāṇa tells us that he had "studied the vedas with the six Aṅgas."[33] He informs

---

24. *Life.*, *Pp.* 74-75.

25. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 111; *Harṣacharita*, *Canto.* 4., *P.* 7.

26. *Here 'Brāhmamukhāḥ' is punningly used. It has two senses.* (1) *Brahmavedāḥ mukhe yeṣām*; *i.e. 'who had the Vedas on their lips'* (2) *Brahmā mukhaṁ yeṣāṁ i. e. 'who had god Brahmā at their heads'. Kane's notes, P.*135; *HCCTH., P.* 111, *fn* 1. *The former sense has been accepted as proper application. M. Williams, however, gives a different meaning. P.* 739.

27. *Nāgānanda, Ed. and tr. Sadhuram, Act* 3, *Pp.* 82-83.

28. 'वेद संख्यये या वेदितं ब्राह्मण्यम्' *Priyadarśikā, Act II, P.* 22.

29. *Ep. Ind., Vol. IV, Pp.* 208-11.

30. *Ibid., IV., Pp.* 208*ff.*

31. *Ibid., Vol. I. P.*

32. *HCCTH., P.* 73. 'वेदाभ्यासपवित्रितमूर्तयः'

—हृ० च०, तृ० उ०, पृ० ३९ ।

33. *HCCTH., P.* 66; सम्यक्पठितः सांगो वेदः ।

—हृ० च०, द्वि० उ०, पृ० ३६ ।

us that after Prabhākaravardhana's death Harṣa was "closely attended by old Brāhmaṇas who were well-versed in the Śruti, Smṛiti and Itihāsa."

The Brāhmaṇas were the teachers and preceptors of the people and as such they enjoyed a place of honour among the people. The houses of Bāṇa's kinsmen are described to have been "filled with the students and disciples who were making noise by continual recitations."[34]

THEIR HOUSES

Bāṇa starts his second canto of the Harṣacharita with a beautiful description of the houses of his kinsmen. They (houses) were "resonant with the sounds of continual recitations, filled with young students attracted by the sacrifices." There were "great terraces in front of the doors which were green with the heaps of Soma plants." They were "filled with the rice and panicum for the 'sacrificial cakes' laid out to be dried, scattered on the skins of the black antelope." There was an abundance of fuel (for Homa), leaves and "bundles of green Kuśa-grass, brought by hundreds of pure disciples." Oblations of rice were offered by young maidens. There were heaps of cowdung and fuel which "covered their terraces in their courts marked by the round hoofs of the cows." A large number of ascetics was busy "in pounding the clay for making pots (Kamaṇḍalas)."

Altars were made for sacrificial fires, with the ground white with the lines of offerings to the Devāḥ. There were "young spotted goats" which were brought for the purpose of sacrifice.[35]

---

34. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 35; अनवरताध्ययनध्वनिमुखराणि,

—ह० च०, द्वि० उ०, पृ० २१।

35. *HCCTH.*, *Pp.* 35-36. तत्रानवरताध्ययनध्वनिमुखराणि, भस्मपुण्ड्रकपाण्डुरललाटैः कपिलशिखाजालजटिलैः कृशानुभिरिव क्रतुलाभागतैर्बटुभिरध्यास्यमानानि, सेकसुकुमारसोमकेदारिकाहरितायमानप्रघणानि, कृष्णाजिनविकीर्णशुष्यत्पुरोडाशीयश्यामाकतण्डुलानि, बालिकाविकीर्यमाणनीवारबलीनि, शुचिशिष्यशतानीयमानहरितकुशपलीपलाशसमिन्धि, इन्धनगोमयपिण्डकुटसंकटानि, आमिक्षीयक्षीरक्षारिणीनामग्निहोत्रधेनूना खुरवलयैर्विलिखिताजिरवितर्दिकानि, कमण्डलव्यमृत्पिण्डमर्दनव्यग्रयतिजनानि, वैतानवेदीशंकव्यानामादुम्बरीणं शाखानां राशिभिः पवित्रितपर्यन्तानि, वैश्वदेवपिण्डपक्तिपाण्डुरितप्रदेशानि, हविर्धूमधूसरितांगनविटपिकिसलयानि, वत्सीयवत्सपालकलालितललसग्न्तर्णकानि, क्रीडत्कृष्णशारच्छागशावकप्रकटितपशुबन्धप्रबन्धानि। —ह० च०, द्वि० उ०, पृ० २१।

The Brāhmaṇas put on the Yajñopavīta or Brahmasūtra.[36] Brahmasūtra was also put on by Brāhmaṇa females. While describing the costume of Sarasvatī Bāṇa says that "her body was purified by the Brahmasūtra."[37] In the Kādambarī Mahāśvetā is also said to have put on the Brahmasūtra.

Though the Brāhmaṇas were respected for their learning and high moral conduct, but their place in the society was also treated higher to other varṇas on the basis of being mere Brāhmaṇas. In the Harṣacharita we are told that "respect was due" even to the Brāhmaṇa "by birth merely and uninitiated by ceremonies."[38] Prince Chandrapīḍa was advised to pay respect to the Brāhmaṇas and throughout his life he was respectful towards them.[39]

THE KṢATRIYAS[40]

The second Varṇa in the social structure of the Hindus during the period under review was that of the Kṣatriyas. According to Yuan Chuang, this class was "the race of kings" and "has held sovereignty for many generations."[41] They are also praised for their "benevolence and mercy."[42] We know that the Ksatriyas were the rulers all over the country when the Chinese pilgrim had paid his visit. But there were a few exceptions also. Yuan Chuang himself has recorded these exceptions. He says that the king of Matipura was of the Śūdra community.[43] According to him, the

---

36. *HCCTH., Pp. 5ff; Kādambarī, Pp.* 105; *There are several references to Yajñopavīta in Harṣa's dramas also.*

37. *HCCTH., P.* 5; ब्रह्मसूत्रेण पवित्रीकृतकाया,—ह० च०, प्र० उ०, पृ० ३।

38. *HCCTH., P.* 7; असंस्कृतमतयोऽपि जात्यैव द्विजन्मानो माननीयाः
—ह० च०, प्र० उ०, पृ० ४।

39. *Kādambarī, Pp. 62ff.* पूजय द्विजातीन्, काद०, सम्पा०परब, १७२।

40. *We do not possess as much material as we have for the study of the Brāhmaṇas. Yet some light is thrown by Yuan Chuang and Bāṇa.*

41. *Watters, I., P.* 168.

42. *Ibid., I, Pp.* 168*ff.*

43. *Watters, Vol. I, P.* 322; *Life., P.* 79.

king Kumāra of Kāmarūpa was a Brāhmaṇa."[44] Another Brāhmaṇa king was ruling over Chitore (Chin-chi-t'o).[45] There were also several such examples; but their insignificant number cannot lead us to any generalization and we can conclude that the Kṣatriya kings were in overwhelming majority. But it would not mean that all the Ksatriyas were ruling over the country. It appears that the pilgrim, generally speaking, came into contact with the ruling Kṣatriya people and, therefore, he recorded that the Kṣatriyas belonged to the race of kings.

Bāṇa describes two famous races of the Kṣatriyas.[46] They are the Lunar and the Solar races. We do not find the direct references in the Harṣacharita about the existence of these races as the separate communities having their relation with the Moon and the Sun, but the inscriptions of the immediate post-Harsa period help us, to a great extent, in reaching to such conclusions.

We find several examples of many Kṣatriyas who are depicted as respecting the Brāhmaṇas. They gave them several gifts and granted land donations. Yuan Chuang speaks of Harsa's charitable deeds for the Brāhmaṇas along with other people.

The Kṣatriyas were noted for their patriotism, valour, courage and heroism. They were great warriors and fought many great battles. The Janapada of Sthāṇvīśvara was regarded as "the land of heroes by the

---

44. *Watters., Vol. II., P.* 186. *He also tells us that the reigning king was "a descent of Nārāyaṇa Deva." This information appears to have been based on the traditions current in those days. We have seen that Bāṇa also traces the origin of the family of the king Bhāskaravarman to Nārāyaṇa in His Boer incarnation. But we cannot rely upon the statement of the Pilgrim that "the sovereignty had been transmitted in the family for* 1000 *generations." Ibid., Vol. II, P.* 186.

45. *Ibid., II, P.* 251. *Cunningham suggests that it should be "identified with the kingdom of Jajhoti, the capital of which was Khajūra which corresponds to the modern district of Bundelakhaṇḍ." Anc. Geog. of India, P.* 481. *This, however is not correct.*

46. *HCCTH., P.* 128; *HCK., Can. I, P.* 16; *THK., Pp.* 29-30.

sons of swords," i. e. the Kṣatriyas.[47] They worshipped their arms, and, it seems that it was customary among the heroes of the Kṣatriya community. Bāṇa informs us that Prabhākaravardhana "worshipped his sword named Aṭṭahāsa with perfumes, scents, frankincense and wreaths."[48]

THE VAIŚYAS

The third Varṇa in the society was that of the Vaiśyas who are said to form "a class of traders."[49] According to Yuan Chuang, they "bartered commodities and pursued gains far and near."[50] Harṣa's dramas contain several examples of business and trade. They are said to have gone as far as Ceylon. Bāṇa also tells of this community while describing the richness and prosperity of Śrīkaṇṭha Janapada. The community of the Vaiśyas was the second most powerful class which wielded power from the very beginning of the Gupta rule. The traders in fact have formed a powerful community throughout the ages and have influenced the life of the people and political atmosphere with the might of their wealth. But it will also be wrong to say that all the Vaiśyas were traders. As all the Kṣatriyas were not the kings, all the Vaiśyas were not traders. The majority of them must have pursued trade. Others must have taken up agriculture and other vocations also.

THE ŚŪDRAS

The fourth class of the people was that of the Śūdras. According to Yuan Chuang they were 'agriculturists.'[51] Here again our pilgrim is not accurate in his description. The majority of the people formed the class of agriculturists and the Śūdras never formed the majority. There

---

47. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 82; वीरक्षेत्रमिति शस्त्रोपजीविभिः,
—ह० च०, तृ० उ०, पृ० ४३-४४।
48. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 91. सम्पादितगन्धधूपमाल्यादिपूजं खंगमट्टहासमकरोत्।
—ह० च०, तृ० उ०, पृ० ५०।
49. *Watters*, *I.*, *P.* 168.
50. *Ibid.*, *I*, *P.* 168.
51. *Ibid.*, *I*, *P.* 168.

were no strict rules about following this occupation.[52] Yuan Chuang himself met a Brāhmaṇa who is said to have been ploughing the land.[53] Some of them were rulers.[54]

THE OUTCASTES

The general condition of these people was not good and satisfactory. They were segregated and were not allowed to mix with the people of the three higher Varṇas. Yuan Chuang mentions butchers, fishermen, public performers, executioners and scavengers who "had their habitations marked by a distinguishing sign."[55] They were living "outside the cities and were required to sneak along on the left when going about in hamlets."[56] This description is confirmed by Bāṇa who informs us that "the Chāṇḍāla maiden had a bamboo stick with its end jagged, with which she made a stroke on the floor to rouse the attention of the king."[57] Bāṇa treats her as "one of Mātaṅga (Chaṇḍāla or lowborn) birth unworthy of being touched."[58]

OTHER MIXED AND OCCUPATIONAL CLASSES

Both Yuan Chuang and Bāṇa describe the mixed and occupational groups of people. The former writes, "There are also the mixed castes; numerous clans formed by groups of people according to their kinds and these cannot be described."[59] Yuan Chuang is evidently very brief in his description of these mixed castes, but he is amply supplemented by Bāṇa

52. *Vātsyāyana prescribed the three approved means of subsistence for the Vaiśya, viz. trade, cattle-rearing and agriculture. Studies in Vātsyāyana's Kāmsūtra, by Chakalder, P.* 99.

53. *Life P.* 73.

54. *Watters, I, P.* 322; *Life., P.* 79.

55. *Watters., Vol. I, P.* 147.

56. *Ibid., I, P.* 147.

57. *Kādambarī, tr. Ridding, P.* 8; सा दूरस्थितैव...पाणिना... नरपतिप्रबोधनार्थं। काद०, संपा० परब, पृ० २०।

58. *Kādambarī, tr. Ridding, Pp.* 8-9; मातंगकुलदूषिता अमूर्तामिव स्पर्शवर्जिताम्। काद०, संपा० परब, पृ० २५।

59. *Watters, I, Pp.* 147 *and* 168.

who draws an elaborate picture of such groups in the contemporary society.

He tells us about a large number of occupational and mixed castes. His knowledge of these people was very wide and he knew about these people from his personal experience. He had a large circle of friends who belonged to these classes.[60] Among whom the following persons deserve mention as they denote occupational groups and classes.

(1) Two cousins of Bāṇa are called "Pāraśavau." We cannot determine with certainty what particular caste the word 'Pāraśavaḥ' denoted. According to Manu[61], 'Pāraśava' means "the son of a Brāhmaṇa from the mother of the Śūdra caste," and such a son was so designated because he was no better than a corpse (śavāḥ) for conferring religious and spiritual benefits which a son was expected to confer. Chandrasena and Mātraṣeṇa were the sons of Bāṇa's uncles. Such people, most probably, formed a debased class of Pāraśavāḥ or degraded Brāhmaṇas.

(2) Bhāṣākavi Īśāna belonged to the class of vernacular poets or that of the composers of songs.[62]

(3) Veṇībhārata was another poet in the company of Bāṇa who belonged to the calss of 'bards or panegyrists.' This class, most probably, consisted of the poets singing the songs of praise of several families at ceremonial occasions such as marriages and births.

(4) Bandis definitely formed one class.

(5) A class of dealers in antidotes. Bāṇa mentions one such man named Mayūraka. The word Jāṅgulika means a physician expert in removing the effects of poison.

(6) A class of betel-bearers (tāmbūladāyakāḥ).

(7) A class of readers (Pustakavāchakāḥ).

We cannot exactly determine the occupation of Pustakavāchaka. He was, perhaps, employed to read some religious and literary works before

---

60. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 32*f*; *HCK.*, *Cant. I*, *P.* 19.

61. यं ब्राह्मणस्तु शूद्रायां कामादुत्पादयेत्सुतम्।
स पारयन्नेव शवस्तस्मात्पारशवः स्मृतः॥ —मनुस्मृति ९, १७८।

62. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 33; *HCK.*, *Notes, canto I*, *P.* 89; *Īśāna seems to be a great vernacular poet.* *N. R. Premi*, *Jain Sāhitya our Itihāsa*, *Pp.* 325, 371.

the people. Bāṇa mentions one pustakavāchaka named Sudṛṣṭhi who came to him to bid farewell when he was leaving for the royal camp. He read some pages of Vāyupurāṇa[63] at that time.

(8) A class of goldsmiths. Bāṇa refers to the goldsmith as 'Kalādaḥ[64] or Svarṇakāraḥ or hemakāraḥ.'[65] All of them appear to have been engaged in making gold ornaments.

(9) The word 'hairikaḥ' is translated in various ways by different scholars. Thomas and Cowell[66] mean by it "the supervisor" whereas commentator Śaṅkara[67] tells us that he would mean a supervisor entrusted with the supervision of the works of goldsmiths. It is also suggested that the word may indicate a 'gem-cutter.'[68] Most probably, it donotes the class of people who were experts in gemmology.

(10) A class of painters *(Chitrakṛitāh)*.

(11) A class of model-makers or manufacturers of dolls *(Pustakṛitāḥ)*. According to the commentator, it mav mean lipyakāra.

(12) A class of drummers (Mārdaṅgikāḥ).

(13) A class of pipers or flute-players (Vānśikāh).

(14) A class of narrators or story-tellers (Kathakāḥ).

(15) A class of leather-workers (Charmakārāḥ).[69]

(16) A class of carpenters.[70]

(17) A class of blacksmiths.

Bāṇa also refers to many other persons who appear to have belonged to one occupational group or other; but, at present, it is not possible to say

63. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 72.

64. *Ibid.*, *P.* 33.

65. *Ibid.*, *P.* 124.

66. *Ibid.*, *P.* 33.

67. *HCK.*, *Notes*, *P.* 90.

68. *HCESA.*, *P.* 28.

69. *Leather-workers are also said to have played on drums on festive occasions. HCCTH*, *P.* 123.

70. *Bāna used the word 'Sūtradhāra' for a carpenter. HCCTH.*, *Pp.* 123-4. *This word was not in vogue in earlier times.*

anything conclusively whether they formed separate social classes as based on their occupations or were only interested in particular trades and their vocations had nothing to do with their castes.

Besides these, Yuan Chuang[71] also mentions certain classes of people such as butchers, fishermen, public performers, executioners and scavengers.

These social groups or sub-castes were not new to the Indian society and to the people of the age of Harṣa. We find many occupational classes even in the Ṛigvedic age[72] and they are found even to-day. These various sub-castes or social groups are the products of several trades and occupations. It was also due to social violations in the codes of marriages and general ethics. When society attached much emphasis on the purity of Varṇas and did not encourage even the *anuloma* marriages, we find many new social groups coming out of such matrimonial alliances which were not socially recognised. The children born out of such unrecognized unions were outcasted and they formed their own separate social class. But it did not result in disturbing the social structure and the importance of the Varṇa continued to enjoy a high place in the social set-up of the Indian society throughout the ages.

Thus we have seen that society was well-composed. Brāhmaṇas enjoyed an exalted and respectable position. The Kṣtriyas and the Vaiśyas were also influential classes in the society. The lot of the Śūdras, however, was not very happy and they did not enjoy all the rights and social privileges which the other three higher Varṇas enjoyed. Yet there was complete social harmony and peace. The people obeyed the social code and the laws of society and, generally speaking, we find no evidence of any transgression of the social laws, morals and customs.

Here also we find a remarkable unity in diversity. The people of all the Varṇas and social groups lived well and harmoniously. In spite of all social and racial distinctions each class was regarded as an integral and inseparable part of the society. Each Varṇa or group performed

---

71. *Watters, Vol. I, P.* 147.

72. *Iyengar, Life in Ancient India in the Age of Mantras, P.* 34.

happily and ungrudgingly all the duties and functions assigned to it. There was no desire for social supremacy and social enhancement of status. Even the Śūdras were satisfied with their lives and occupation. There were no agitations and mass movements to sow the seeds of discontent and disaffection. There was complete class understanding and social harmony. All the classes believed in the proper application of the rules of social conduct. Social obligations, general customs and traditions and duties of the people were maintained. And the moral values and spiritual ideals were treated as of primary importance. All differentiations and distinctions resulted in social readjustment and general harmony. It was generally looked upon as a common goal of all individuals who constituted the society. The society assigned to each individual his due postition in the social structure and it regularised his relations with other people of the other communities. It provided all possible help for one's material attainments and moral development and brought harmony and understanding between man and man. Taken as a whole the entire social structure was certainly unique and well-organised. All the social groups lived with the one common culture, common traditions and common heritage.

THE INSTITUTION OF THE ĀŚRAMA[73]

The true picture of Indian life cannot be properly realized without the study of the four orders of life popularly known as the Āśramas. With the gradual development of the Varna system there grew side by side a deep-rooted system of worship and religious practices; there grew a method of self-sacrifice and deep-rooted love for spiritual attainments and philosophical penetration in the mysterious and inexplicable existence of the Universe and the Supreme Being.

The life of an individual during the Vedic and Upaniṣadic times was influenced by these currents and cross-currents and accordingly there

73. *The word 'Āśrama' is originally derived from the Sanskrit root 'Śram' i.e. 'to exert oneself.' Therefore it may correspond, by derivation, to (1) a place where exertions are performed and (2) the way of performing such exertions. Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics. On 'Āśrama' by P. Deussen.*

developed the practice of the Āśramas. The life of an individual came to be divided into the four periods of equal durations and it was maintained that one should proceed from one Āśrama to the other.

The Āśramas are regarded to be divinely ordained by the Smṛiti writers, and it was the sacred duty of the individual to lead one's life accordingly. Manu says, "Having spent the first fourth part of his life in the house of his Guru, the second fourth in his own house with his wife, the third part in the forest, one should take Saṅnyāsa in the fourth part, casting away every worldly tie."[74] Hārīta[75] and Dakṣa[76] regard this fourfold division of life as unalterable and inviolable. It was to be practised with earnestness and devotion by those who desired the imperishable world.[77] In fact, it formed the basis of the whole super-structure of the Hindu social institutions.[78] But we must note one important point that these four phases of life were practised by individuals in order to obtain salvation (*Mokṣa*), and, therefore, they were practised voluntarily. Society never imposed this four-fold division on individuals forcibly.

THE ĀŚRAMAVYAVASTHĀ IN THE TIMES OF HARṢA

Besides the epigraphic evidences which we have already discussed in connection with Varṇavyavasthā, there are numerous references in the literature about the practice and application of the Āśrama system during the age of Harṣavardhana. This will be amply clear from the description that follows.

BRAHMACHARYĀŚRAMA

After the Upanayana ceremony was performed, the young boy

---

74. चतुर्थमायुषो भागं वसित्वाद्यं गुरोः कुले।
द्वितीयमायुषार भागं कृतदारो गृहे वसेत्॥
वनेषु च विहृत्यैवं तृतीयं भागमायुषः।
चतुर्थमायुषो भागं त्यक्त्वा संगान्परिव्रजेत॥ मनुस्मृति ४. १, २।
75. *Saṁskāra Mayūkha*, *P.* 64.
76. *Dakṣa Smṛiti.* 1.12.
77. *MS., III.* 79.
78. *Prabhu, Hindu Social Organization, P.* 75.

was to start his Brahmacharyāśrama. Bāṇa gives a vivid picture of the Brahmachāris who got education at the Gurukulas and at the houses of the learned Brāhmaṇas. We are told that the houses of the kinsmen of Bāṇa were filled with the students and disciples who "were making noise by continual recitation."[79] We are also sure about the Upanayana ceremony of a boy. Bāṇa informs us about his own life and tells us that in his case all the saṁskāras were duly performed. He says that before he reached the age of fourteen he "had passed through initiation (*Upanayana*) and other saṁskāras, including that of Samāvartana."[80] There was a fixed code of conduct for the young students which they observed with complete devotion and strictness.

The foreheads of these students are said to have been made "white with sectarial marks made of ashes."[81] They possessed "the fuel, leaves and bundles of green Kuśa grass."[82] We have a beautiful description of a youthful ascetic Pundarika who is described by Mahāśvetā "with his locks" (Pingalajatām) and "with the lines of ashes (*bhasma*) and sandal on his forehead"[83] The Brahmachāris are generally described carrying the pitchers (Kamandalāni) in their hands[84] They observed strict celibacy which is very clear from the statement of Mahāśvetā, who had fallen in love with Pundarika. She reflects that "if he (Puṇḍarika) would see the effect of love, he would not approve that folly and would curse in wrath."[85]

---

79. *HCCTH., P.* 35; अनवरताध्ययनध्वनिमुखराणि,—हृ० च०, द्वि० उ०, पृ० २१।

80. *HCCTH. P.* 32; कृतोपनयनादिक्रियाकलापस्य समावृत्तस्य
—हृ० च०, प्र० उ०, पृ० १९।

81. *HCCTH., P.* 35; भस्मपुण्ड्कपाण्डरललाटैः —हृ० च०, द्वि० उ०, पृ० २१। कादम्बरी, सपा० पग्ब, पृ० ८३ ।

82. *HCCTH., Pp.* 35-36; हरितकुशपूलीपलाश समिन्धि
—हृ० च०, द्वि उ०, पृ० २१।

83. *Kādambari, tr. Ridding, Pp.* 104.129*ff*; रचितचंदनललाट त्रिपुण्ड्कम्। काद०, सपा० पग्ब, पृ० ३५० ।

84. *Kādambari, tr. Ridding, P.* 108; *HCCTH., P.* 36.

85. *Kādambari, tr. Ridding, P.* 107; कदाचिदनभिमतस्यविकारदर्शनकुपितोऽय शापाभिशा करोतिमाम्। कादम्बरी, पृ० २०७।

This strict life of a Brahmachārī is in conformity with the rules which have been laid down in our treatises on social conduct.[86]

THE GṚIHASTHĀŚRAMA

This was the second phase of life. Of all the Āśramas the Gṛihasthāśrama is given a very highly respectable and indispensable place in our social structure. The smṛitis and dharmaśāstras praise highly the life of a householder and regard it as the pivot of the whole social order. Manū says, "Just as all creatures exist depending on air, so do all the Āśramas depend upon the householder."[87] The Mahābhārata has also emphasised the importance of the Gṛihasthāśrama.[88] Vātsyāyan says that after getting one's education one should enter into the life of the householder. His Kāmasūtra is concerned entirely with this part of life.

During the age of Harṣa it was the well-established and deep-rooted social institution. Bāṇa recalls with satisfaction that he had been a deligent householder since his marriage.[89] The householders performed their social and religious duties and fulfilled all the duties and obligations assigned to them with devotion and earnestness. The principal duties of a householder are to offer sacrifices and to live in accordance with the rules as laid down in our codes of conduct and which are our sacred Texts. His duties are to worship the gods and the ancestral deities, to entertain the guests, to show mercy to the poor and the distressed and to live according to the precepts of the Smṛitis and the Śrutis.[91] We find that these duties were earnestly performed by Harsa and the people of his times.

---

86. *Manusmṛiti, III.* 2. *and II.* 173-222; *Yajñavalkya, I,* 52; *Kāmandaka, II.* 25. 26.

87. *Manusmṛiti, III.* 77.

88. *Mahābhārata, Shāntiparva, Adhyāya* 11. *Yudhiṣṭharaṁ Prati gārhasthyasya Śreṣṭhayopapadānaṁ i. e. Exposition on the superiority of Gṛihasthāśrama to Yudhiṣṭhira.*

89. *HCCTH., P.* 66; दारपरिग्रहादभ्यगारिकोऽस्मि।

—हृ० च०, द्वि० उ०, पृ० ६६।

90. *Kāmandakīya Nītisāra., tr. M. N. Dutta, II.* 25-26. *P.* 21.

THE VĀNAPRASTHĀŚRAMA

During this phase of life of an individual one gave up all his pursuits of 'artha' and 'Kāma' and left his near and dear ones and abandoned all his worldly belongings and material possessions with a view to attaining the spirit of complete detachment in life. He used to go to the forest where he tried to train himself for the final āśrama by constant meditation.

During Harṣa's age we find that people in their old age developed a sense of indifference to their worldly belongings and affairs. They used to retire to penance groves. In the Nāgānandam the Naṭi tells the stage-manager that her father-and-mother-in-law had retired to the forest.[91] Sometimes the people after some severe shocks also used to retire to the forest even in tender age. Harsa is said to have "mused" after his father's death, "Pray heaven, my brother, when he learns of our father's death, may not assume two robes of bark or seek a hermitage as a royal sage,"[92] and we know that the later course of events proved that what Harsa suspected was correct. Rājyavardhana decided to leave the palace for hermitage and his decision was changed only when the news of Grahavarman's treacherous assassination reached him.

The life in this period was full of detachment and people lived on what was available in the forests. After Puṇḍarīka's death, Mahāśveta began to live on water and the roots and fruits of the forests.[93] Bāṇa further informs that sages, neglecting marriage and dispensing with domestic life took refuge in desolate forests.[94]

THE SANNYĀSA

This last phase of life provided the fullest opportunities for the self-expression and self-realization. This was the state of complete

---

91. *Nag., Act. I, P. 3.*

92. *HCCTH., P.* 62. अपि नाम तातस्य मरणं...आयोबाष्पजलस्नातो न गृहणीयाद्वल्कले, नाश्रयेद्वा राजर्षिराश्रमपदम् । —ह० च०, प० उ०, पृ० ३५ ।

93. *Kādambarī, tr. Ridding, P.* 135.

94. *HCCTH., P.* 122; एतद्भ्यादकृतदारपरिग्रहाः परिगृहवसतयः शून्यान्यरण्यान्यधिशेरते मुनयः, —ह० च०, च० उ०, पृ० १३ ।

renunciation and detachment from the material world. At this stage one surrendered all that was near and dear to him in the world in order to realize the real self, the Ātman. During the Harṣa's age we have innumerable examples of such sages who left the worldly pleasures and went to the forests to live a life of renunciation in order to attain the fullest detachment from the material world. Divākaramitra was a sage of such type. Bāṇa speaks in a very reverential tone to express his respect and devotion to Divākaramitra.[95] He also informs about other sages and saints who were indifferent to worldly pain and pleasure,[96] and trained themselves to the path of renunciation.[97] They had no love or attachment for worldly things. When Bhairavāchārya went to the king Puṣpabhūti the latter placed himself, his treasury, his harem, and his court at the disposal of the former.[98] The ascetic replied with a smile, "What have we children of the woods to do with power and wealth."[99] This indicates the worldly detachment of the sages and saints. Asceticism was not limited to men alone. We find several ladies also who are said to have followed this path. In the Kāmasūtra female ascetics find prominent place as Parivrājikā, Śramaṇā, Kṣapaṇikā, Tāpsī, Bhikṣukī (*ṇī*) and Muṇḍā etc.[100]

At various places Bāṇa mentions some of these female ascetics. Many aged female ascetics surrounded the queen of king Tārāpīḍa. They read and recited the legends (from the religious texts) to the queen.[101] Among the several companions of Bāṇa during his wanderings, there was

---

95. *HCCTH.*, *Pp.* 233-243; *HCK.*, *Can.* 8, *Pp.*, 71-77.
96. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 162; 'समदुःखसुखाश्च समाश्रिताः'
—ह० च०, पं० उ०, पृ० ३५ ।
97. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 162; 'अविगतात्मतत्त्वाः' —ह० च०, पं० उ०, पृ० ३५ ।
98. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 89; तस्मै च राजासान्तःपुरं सपरिजनं सकोषमात्मानं निवेदितवान् ।
—ह० च०, तृ० उ०, पृ० ४८ ।
99. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 89; तात, क्व विभवः, क्व च वयं वनवासिताः ।
—ह० च०, तृ० उ०, पृ० ४९ ।
100. *Chakalder, Studies in Vātasāyan's Kāmasūtra*, *P.* 111.
101. *Kādambarī, tr. Ridding*, *P.* 70.

an ascetic widow (*Kātyāyanikā*) named Chakravākikā.[102] Kādambaīr is also said to have been surrounded by wandering ascetics (Parivrājikābhiḥ) "with marks of white ashes on their foreheads."[103]

We must, however, remember that it was neither compulsory nor obligatory to follow this phased programme of fourfold disivion of life popularly known as the āśramavyavasthā in the world. It was purely voluntary and only a minority appears to have been inclined to practise it.

THE INSTITUTION OF MARRIAGE

According to Hindu view of life, marriage has been looked upon as a great and sacred social institution that unites man and woman in the social and religious bonds. In the Vedic age marriage was performed ceremoniously. At that occasion wedding hymns were chanted and the bridegroom grasped the hand of the bride and led her round the fire;[104] people used to pray for perfect harmony and happiness in conjugal life and the couple was blessed with sons and grandsons.[105] This is a definite proof of the sacred nature of this institution and shows how essential it was regarded for the individual as well as for the entire community. With the growth of religious consciousness and social obligations marriage became a "religious duty incumbent upon every individual and the centre of all domestic sacrifices."[106] It was regarded as a sacrifice and an unmarried person (apatnikaḥ) was looked upon as "one without sacrifice" (*ayajñah*),[107] and a man without wife was a half man.[108]

Thus marriage as a social institution gained greater importance and sanctity in Hindu social organization. With the origin and development of the Āśramas marriage came to be regarded as an inviolable and

---

102. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 33.
103. *Kādambari*, *P.* 162; "धवलभस्मललाटिकाभिः"
104. *VA.*, *P.* 389.
105. *Ibid.*, *P.* 389.
106. *HS*, *P.* 261.
107. अयज्ञो व एष योऽपत्नीकः
108. अयो अर्धो व स्व आत्मनः यत्पत्नी, *Quoted in HS.*, *P.* 261.

indispensable institution for the fulfilment of ones social aims and obligation in the gṛihasthāśrama which was regarded as the most important of all other āśramas. During the age of the Sūtras and Smṛitis the institution of marriage gained further importance. The Dharmasūtras and the Smṛitis endorsed the Āśrama theory and laid down the social code of conduct that one should marry soon after he completes his Brahmacharyāśrama. According to Dakṣa, the first three āśramas are socially obligatory and unalterable and he declared that any breach would mean a serious violation and an irreligious action.[109] Yājñavalkya opines that "a man, be he a Brāhmaṇa, Kṣatriya, Vaiśya or Śūdra, who is without a wife is unfit for religious duties."[110] Thus we see that marriage was a sacred social institution necessitated by religious and sacrificial purposes and motives. According to Hindu view of life marriage was also necessitated in order to have a son who is socially and religiously recognised to be worthy of offerring oblations.[111]

INSTITUTION OF MARRIAGE DURING THE AGE OF HARṢA

According to the Hindu view of married life, eight types of marriages are commonly recognized by the ancient authors of Śrutis and Smṛitis.[112] We do not find any systematic and categorical description of these eight types[131] of marriages in our sources on the period under review, but the available accounts enable us to come to some definite conclusions that almost all of these types were found in some way or other during the age of Harṣavardhana.

The Brāhma type of marriage is generally regarded as the first

---

109. *Dakṣa śmriti;* 1.12.

110. अपत्नीको नरो (भूप) कर्मयोग्यो न जायते।
ब्राह्मणः क्षत्रियो व ऽपि वैश्यः शूद्रोऽपि वा (नृपः)। याज्ञ० स्मृ० १. ५१।

111. पुत्रार्थे क्रियते भार्या पुत्रः पिण्डप्रयोजनः

112. *MS., III.* 21; *YS., I.* 58-61; *Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra.,* *tr. R. Samasastry, P.* 172.

113. *These eight types are :Brāhma, Deva, Ārṣa, Prājāpatya, Asura, Gāndharva, Rākṣasa* and *Paiśācha.*

and the purest form of marriage.[114] In this type of marriage the girl was given by the father along with the ornaments and wealth to a worthy groom, whom he invited and received respectfully.[115]

In the Harṣacharita we have an elaborate description of Rājyaśrī's marriage who was given to Grahavarman along with many articles of dowry and several presents. This marriage is the best example of Brāhma Vivāha and it reflects on the social decency and religious considerations pertaining to the marriage ceremony which were fully observed during Harṣa's times.

The next type of marriage was Deva in which the girl was given by a father to the Priest as a dakṣiṇā. We have no evidences of such marriages during the period under review.

The third and the fourth types are Ārṣa and Prājāpatya respectively. These types of marriages are not found during this period.

The next and the widely popular form of marriage was that of Gāndharva. It was mutually arranged by the bride and the bridegroom "for sensualistic and passional gratification."[116] This type of marriage is found to have been in vogue during all times. We have some examples of its existence even in the Ṛgvedic age,[117] and it has continued upon the present times.

Our sources offer a number of examples of the Gāndharva type of marriage during the age of Harṣa. It was, generally speaking, more prevalent among the Ksatriyas than among any other Varṇas of the Hindu Society. Jīmūtavāhana's marriage with Malayavatī is rightly characterised as Gāndharva vivāha.[118] This type of marriage is also mentioned in the Ratnāvalī and the Priyadarśikā.[119] A very good

114. *Manusmṛti, III.* 27; *Yaj. Sm., I.* 58.
115. आच्छाद्य चार्चयित्वा च श्रुति शीलवते स्वयम्।
आहूयदानं कन्याया ब्राह्मो धर्मः प्रकीर्ति तः॥ मनुस्मृति, ३. २७।
116. *MS., III.* 32.
117. *R. V., X.* 27. 17. *Quoted in HS., P.* 278.
118. *Nāgānanda., Act. II, Pp.* 68-69.
119. *Priyadarśikā, Pp.* 64, 91.

example of the Gāndharva type of marriage is found in the Kādambarī where Bāṇa's character says, "Though marriage resting only on mutual love is lawful yet let us follow the custom of the world."[120] This indicates that Gāndharva marriage was treated as lawful marriage but it also gives us an impression that it was not looked upon as an appreciable type of marriage in the society, and, therefore, it was followed by the customary religious ceremonies, rites and rituals.

But marriages by mutual consent have nothing to do with the Svayaṁvaras. It appears that the institution of the Svayaṁvara had become obsolete. In the entire literature of Bāṇa and Harṣa and Yuan Chuang's accounts we do not find a single example of the Svayaṁvara being performed. Had there been the Svayaṁvaras in voque the pilgrim must have mentioned them or we might have got some information pertaining to the Svayaṁvaras in literary works or in other contemporary records.

NEGOTIATIONS FOR MARRIAGE

From Bāṇa's description it seems almost certain that in the negotiations for the marriage the initiative was first taken by the party of the groom. We are told in the Harsacharita that several kings and princes had sent their envoys to seek Rājyaśrī's hand.[121] Grahavarman had also prayed for her. We have further indications that though a bride might have other merits, the wise people specially inclined towards good family while concluding matrimonial alliances.[122] Though the father appears to have enjoyed the final voice, he usually consulted his wife and sons to finalise the matrimonial negotiations.[123]

---

120. *Kādambarī, tr. Ridding, P.* 208. 'अपि च यद्यप्यस्माकमयमेव परस्परानुरागनिष्पन्नो धर्म्यो विवाहस्तथापि लोकसंव्यवहारोऽनुवर्तनीय" कादम्बरी, संपा०, परब, पृ० ७०८ ।

121. *HCCTH., P.* 121-122.

122. *Ibid., P.* 121.

123. *Ibid., P.* 122.

BETROTHAL CEREMONY

As soon as the negotiations were finalized the betrothal ceremony was to follow. We learn from the Harṣacharita that on an auspicious day the betrothal ceremony was performed by king Prabhākaravardhana, the father of the bride, in the presence of the whole royal household. He is said to have performed the betrothal ceremony by pouring the betrothal water upon the hand of an envoy extraordinary who had arrived at Prabhākaravardhana's court previously with instructions from Grahavarman.[124] This must have been the common custom of betrothal ceremony prevalent in those days.

THE MARRIAGE CEREMONY

In his description of Rājyaśrī's marriage Bāna has drawn a vivid picture of the marriage ceremony as it was performed. In this description we find glimpses of marriage ceremonies and several rituals during the period under review. Bāṇa's colourful, vivid and poetic account seems to be "true to fact and nature,"[125] and, perhaps, without any adequate parallel in the whole of our ancient literature.[126]

PREPARATIONS FOR THE CEREMONY

We are told in the Harsacharita that the grand preparations were made for the occasion and it appears that people used to celebrate the marriages of their children with great pomp and show. This was definitely correct about the higher classes at least. Yuan Chuang also tells u about the richer classes and their spendthrift proclivities. He says about the people of Sthāṇviśvara that "the rich families vied with each other in extravagance."[127]

At such occasions many relatives, friends and favourites were

---

124. *Ibid., P.* 123. शोभने च दिवसे दुहितृदानजलमपातयत्।

—ह० च०, च० उ०, पृ० १३।

125. *HMHI., I., P.* 94.
126. *HCESA., P.* 70.
127. *Watters, I.* 314.

invited to attend these ceremonies.[128] The festal drums were struck sharply. Troubandours crowded the courts; artists, carpenters, gold-workers, leather-workers, painters and others expert in decoration works were engaged to beautify the palace.[129]

The palace walls were white-washed. Reverberations of auspicious music filled the whole atmosphere.[130] Bāṇa tells us in a magniloquent manner much about the grandeur and richness of the elaborate preparations. The palace was full of beauty. We can briefly summarise that elaborate and grand preparations were made for the marriage ceremony of the princess Rājyaśrī. The people, in general, must have been celebrating the marriages of their children according to their means; but they appear to be quite generous and extravagant.

MARRIAGE RITUALS

Marriage was performed according to the code and customs as laid down in the Dharmaśāstras. The marriage altar (*Vivāhavedī*) was prepared and a band of astronomers and paṇḍitas was invited to find out the auspicious moment with great accuracy. After the arrival of the marriage party the betel-bearer was sent to the bride's house to communicate their arrival formally.[131] This man was also entrusted to see that no mishap would take place owing to any negligence on the part of any body. Very great importance was attached to the accuracy of the time of marriage as decided by elaborate previous calculations. One man was especially appointed to look into the matter that every thing was performed according to appointed time and routine.

THE RECEPTION OF THE MARRIAGE PARTY

ge

Due to some inadvertent mistake four pages (353 *to* 356) *have been numbered wrongly. It's a printer's devil. But the matter is in order and its continuity is unbroken.* —*Author*

mg

party (*Varayātrā*). We are told that innumerable decorated elephants and horses were brought with the marriage party. When the groom and his party arrived at the gate, the king and his sons "accompanied by their royal retinue went forth on foot to meet them."[132] After dismounting the groom was given "a hearty embrace with outstretched arms" by Prabhākaravardhana. Next in order, he was embraced by Rājyavardhana and Harsavardhana.[133] After this reception was over the bridegroom was taken inside the palace by the king where the latter honoured the groom with a seat "equal to his own and with other honours."[134] From there the bridegroom proceeded to the bridal house (*Kautukagṛiha*). The bride was "arrayed in the special costume suited for the ceremony." There the groom accompanied the bride proceeded to the marriage altar. Flames were kindled in the altar. Close to the fire "unsoiled green Kuśa grass was set and bundles of pounding stones, antelope skins, ghee, garlands and fuel (for sacrifice) were brought." The bridegroom first ascended the altar and after the bridal rites had been fully completed, the "husband bowed with his newly-wedded wife to the latter's parents" and thus the marriage was completed.

This description of Rājyaśrī's marriage, as stated above, makes it certain that the marriage ceremony was treated as one of the most important saṁskāras of an individual in the Hindu society and as such it was conducted in accordance with the codified rules as laid down in the Smṛitis and Dharmaśāstras.

Strangely enough, Bāṇa also refers to one peculiar custom which appears to have been prevailing in those times. After the marriage ceremony was over the newly-wedded couple went to their decorated chamber (the

---

132. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 128. *The custom is note-worthy and we find a significant parallel of it in our times.*

133. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 128. *It is strange to note that Bāṇa does not mention any of the groom's parents and guardians and this confirms our earlier analysis that Avantivarman was no more when the marriage of his son Grahavarman with princess Rājyaśrī was solemnised.*

134. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 128.

śvāsagriha) which was especially constructed for enjoying the honey-moon. We are told that the bridegroom "spent his ten blissful days" with his bride and then "set out with his bride to his native country."[135]

MARRIAGEABLE AGE

On the basis of this elaborate and detailed description of Rājyaśrī's marriage we can safely conclude that early marriage did not take place at that time. We are not sure about Rājyaśrī's exact age; but she had reached the marriageable age definitely as we are told by her father Prabhākara-vardhana. The latter says to his wife that their daughter was a grown-up girl[136] and that she was a swollen-breasted lady (*Payodharonnamanā*).[137]

INTER-CASTE MARRIAGES

Generally speaking, the marriages were permitted within a varṇa and people did not recognize the inter-caste marriages, but we find several examples where inter-caste marriages are found to have taken place in the society. But there is no ground to generalize that inter-caste marriages were socially recognized. Yuan Chuang says, "The members of a caste marry within the caste, the great and the obscure keeping apart."[138] But here the pilgrim's account, as we have already referred to, does not appear as fully correct as we have many other examples of inter-caste marriage. Both Anuloma and Pratiloma marriages were also solemnised during the age of Harsa. Bāṇa mentions that he had two cousins whom he terms as "Pārśavau," i.e. sons of a Brāhmaṇa father through a Śūdra wife. Epigraphic evidences offer many such examples of this nature in the sixth and the seventh centuries. Harichandra, the progenitor of the Pratihāras, who was himself a Brāhmaṇa, married Bhadrā, a lady of the Kṣatriya community.[139] A Brāhmaṇa named Ravikīrti married Bhānūguptā, a

---

135. *Ibid.*, *P.* 132.
136. *Ibid.*, *P.* 122; तरुणीभूता वत्सा राज्यश्री —हृ० च०, च० उ०, पृ० १३ ।
137. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 122.
138. *Watters.*, *I.*, *P.* 168.
139. *Ep. Ind.*, *Vol. XVIII*, *P.* 95.

Vaiśya lady.[140] An ancestor of Hastibhoja, a Brāhmaṇa, married a Kṣatriya wife.[141] Later in the last quarter of the tenth century A.D., the great poet Rājaśkhara, a Brāhmaṇa, married a Chahamāna princess.

Thus many other similar examples can be cited. But it should not be understood, as already told in the beginning, that such marriages were socially recognized as valid marriages. They were, after all exceptions. And, therefore, Yuan Chuang is right when he says that "the members of a caste marry within the caste." He rightly understood that inter-caste marriages were not socially common and religiouslv recognized forms of marriages.

The pilgrim further relates that "relations whether by father's or by mother's side do not intermarry." Yuan Chuang is completely right and accurate in his statement so far as the conditions in the Northern India were concerned; but in southern India such marriages were performed as early as the period of Vātsāyana[142] at least Such restrictions are still found in northern India till today, but in south there are no restrictions of this kind.

REMARRIAGE OF WIDOWS

Yuan Chuang is not clear in his description pertaining to the remarriage of widows. He says "A woman never contracts a second marriage."[143] It can be interpreted in different ways and we cannot conclude any thing positively and conclusively. But one thing seems to be certain that remarriage of the widows of higher Varnas was not allowed in the society.[144] Yet enforced widowhood did not fully exist in those days.[145]

---

140. *CII., Vol. III, Pp.* 182-84.

141. *Arch. Sur. Rep. West. India, Vol. IV, P.* 140. *cited in HMHI, I, P.* 62.

142. *Chakaladar, Studies in the Kāmasūtra, P.* 133.

143. *Watters, I, P.* 168.

144 *PO., Vol. XVI,* 1951, *P.* 104.

145. *HMHI., I, Pp.* 95-96.

MARRIED LIFE

The mutual relations between husband and wife were harmonious and cordial. This was mainly based on our religious outlook towards married life. Manu declares that mutual fidelity till death is the essence of the highest Dharma for husband and wife; once they are united by the marriage ceremony, they must always exert themselves to see that they are never at variance with each other.[146] The true aim of marriage in the Hindu Society is the realisation of the "permanent and unbreakable partnership."[147] The infallible and inviolable sacredness and the major emphasis on the importance of character in married life was well noticed during the period under review; peace and harmony, happiness and partnership worked as the basis of married life. Both men and women obeyed the laws as laid down in the Śrutis and Smṛitis. True love existed between them. There was no quarrel for rights and privileges. But when husbands indulged in love-affairs, we find wives objecting to such affairs vehemently. This is but natural for all the women of all ages and all classes and of all the countries. It is based on human instincts. Ratnāvalī and Priyadarśikā offer best examples of this type. There is nothing abnormal in it. It is but natural.

All the women characters in the contemporary literature represent noble ideals of a married life. King Prabhākaravardhana loved his wife sincerely and devotedly and sought her advice on almost all the major family issues. To Yaśomatī her husband was "the fount of life and joy on the earth" and when his end approached near she ended her own life in order to die unwidowed. This was supposed to be one of the highest and noble aims of a wife.

THE SYSTEM OF DOWRY

From the very dawn of our civilisation, marriages were generally associated with the dowry system in some way or other. There might have been changes in the forms and modes of dowry, but in essence the

146. *MS., IX.* 101-102.

147. *Urwick, The Social Good, P.* 137.

system has remained almost unchanged. During the Vedic period dowry was given along with the bride,[148] and "when pre-puberty marriages began to be regarded as sacred, dowry became an essential addition."[149] It was this religious conception of marriage as a sacrifice which strengthened the system of dowry. Later on, it began to enjoy social recognition and was looked upon as a desirable institution.[150]

Our sources of information record that during the age of Harṣa dowry was definitely given at the time of marriage ceremony and the parents were required to offer dowry in order to find out the grooms. Though Yuan Chuang is completely silent about dowry system, Bāṇa has thrown some light on it. He says in connection with Rājyaśrī's marriage that "the courtyards were seas of elephants and horses which were to be presented as bridal gifts."[151] Later he clearly refers to several articles grouped as "provisions named in dowry (*Yautaka*)."[152] Kādambarī's father Chitrārtha offered Chandrapīḍa his whole kingdom with the hand of his daughter.[153] These are some evidences which clearly indicate the vogueness of the dowry system among the higher classes at least.

It will not be irrelevent to assert that this system worked well and it was really desirable when any other proper legal provision for inheritance did not exist in our society. Such an arrangement gained adequate and acceptable recognition in the absence of such provisions. It was quite natural for the kind and affectionate parents to ensure an adequate economic security to a daughter when she left her home to embark upon her new phase of life with an unknown partner. This was also done with a purpose of enhancing the status of a daughter in the house of her in-laws. With this voluntary spirit the gift of dowry must have been regarded as a

---

148. *VA.*, *P.* 453.; *RV.*, *X.* 23.11. *cited in HS.*, *Pp.* 284-85.
149. *Ibid.*, *P.* 285.
150. *Ibid.*, *Pp.* 28*ff.*
151. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 124.
152. *Ibid.*, *P.* 131; *Monier Williams*, *P.* 859.
153. *Kādambarī*, *tr. Ridding*, *P.* 208.

moral duty of the parents to secure their daughter's future against probable vicissitudes and destitution.

STATUS OF WOMEN

The attitude of the people of a particular community towards women has an important and great social significance in any society and any period. The attitude of the Hindus of the seventh century A.D. towards women is clear from their importance in social life which I have tried to estimate during the course of my discussion on Gṛihasthāśrama and Marriage. We must now consider the status of the womankind as a whole and in general in order to give a picture of woman's place in the Hindu society during Harṣa's times.

WOMAN AS DAUGHTER

The birth of a girl was, generally speaking, a source of much anxiety and sorrow to the Hindu parents of this period. When she reached the marriageable age this anxiety and pain increased. This pain and anxiety was mainly there because of the daughter's inevitable departure to her husband's home. The most pathetic sentiments are expressed by Bāṇa who puts the following words in the mouth of Prabhākaravardhana. The latter says to his wife, "The thought of her (Rājyaśrī's) never for a moment leaves my heart. As soon as ever girls near maturity, their fathers become fuel to the flame of pain... Children born of our body, dandled at our breasts, are taken from us by someone unknown to us."[154] He further gives a general expression to the fatherly feelings, "Good men grieve at a daughter's birth and noble men offer water to their daughters even at birth."[155] And therein we find an explanation for Bāṇa's silence about any sort of celebration at the birth of Rājyaśrī whereas we find a beautiful description of merry-making at the birth day celebrations of her two brothers. In Bāṇa's Harṣacharita we find three pertinent points pertaining to the life of a girl.

---

154. *HCCTH., P.* 122.

155. *HCCTH., P.* 122. जातायां दुहितरि दूयन्ते सन्तः।...जन्मकाल एव कन्यकाभ्यः प्रयच्छन्ति सलिलमञ्जुलिं साधवः। —ह० च०, च० उ०, पृ० १२।

Firstly, the marriage of a girl was the parent's serious concern and it put them to the greatest anxiety and sorrow as she grew mature and reached the marriageable age.

Secondly, the bridegroom was generally an outsider, not related by blood to the girl's parents.[156]

Thirdly, the departure of a beloved daughter has been the most painful occasion and it caused an overwhelming grief in parent's life. She was born with the inevitable future of separation from her near and dear ones.

WOMAN AS WIFE

Woman as a wife was the most obedient and faithful partner to her husband. She shared his happiness as well as sorrow and led a harmonious life. But it appears from the writings of Bāṇa, and on the basis of other evidences of that period, that polygamy might have caused some miseries and sorrows. We know it for certain that polygamy existed in those days. Prabhākaravardhana had many queens and the chief queen alone enjoyed the privileged status and she alone was entitled to social and religious benefits. Other queens were subservient to her Widows of conquered and slain kings were forcibly put into the harem of the victor, where they seem to have been accepted as concubines. The wives of ordinary people must have been in a better social and domestic position.

On major issues the advice of the wife was taken; but the final decision was taken by the husband. It is clear from the reply of Yaśomati she gave to her husband when she was asked to consider the appropriateness of Grihavarman as a match for Rājyaśrī. She says, "Mothers are nothing more to their daughters than nurses. In bestowing them, the father is the authority."[157] This shows the supremacy of the will of the husband. We find intense love between the wife and the husband. Wife

---

156. *The situation in Southern India was different. I have discussed this point while writing on marriage.*

157. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 123. संवर्धनमात्रोपयोगिन्यो धात्रीनिर्विशेषा भवन्ति खलु मातरः कन्यकानाम्। प्रदाने तु प्रमाणमासां पितरः। —हु० च०, च० उ०, पृ० १२।

did not come forward to challenge the supremacy of her husband who had the final word in all matters. Girls were brought up in an environment where a man had a higher and better position and a woman was taught and trained to obey her husband. Constant service and unqualified obedience to a husband were the supreme duties of a dutiful wife. This was not only noticed in those times but during all times and in all parts of our country.

WOMAN AS MOTHER

Motherhood is the culmination of the noble ideals, sincere love, sacrifice, sufferings and devotion for which womankind has due claim to reverence and worship. Even the impact of science and technology could bring no change in this instinctive uniqueness of woman as mother. During the times of Harṣa, too, women seem to have been extremely desirous to be mothers. Bāṇa gives a detailed account of the sufferings and sacrifices that Vilāsavatī had undergone to be blessed with a son. Yaśomatī, too, was extremely happy when her dream was analysed as the prognastication of the birth of two sons and a daughter. After the husband the son was regarded as the responsible guardian and supporter of his mother. The mothers also believed in this ideal and followed it sincerely. Mothers seem to have been strict in discipline and proper training of their children but the strictness of discipline was always associated with tender love.

Thus it can be safely concluded that general attitude of the society towards the women was full of respect and they were given their due place in the domestic, social and religious spheres of life.

THE PURDĀH SYSTEM

We cannot positively determine the existence of the purdāh system during the period under review. It seems that purdāh was not in vogue in those days. It was neither common nor strict as we find today. Bāṇa informs that "village wives hastened to the neighbouring villages with baskets filled with various forest flowers."[158] Even the ladies of higher

158. *HCCTH.*, *Pp.* 227-228.

families did not observe strict purdāh. Yuan Chuang records that Rājyaśrī was present at both the religious assemblies at Kanauj and Prayāg. Her mother accompanied her husband on almost all important occasions. We find her sitting by the side of sick-bed where Prabhākaravardhana was lying ill and the ministers and high officials of the State were allowed to go in.[159] We often find minister Śukanāsa in the inner apartments of the palace and talking with the queen.[160] Bāṇa informs us that Yaśomatī gave certain important instructions to the ministers before she plunged into the fire to die unwidowed.[161] With these evidences and several others in view I do not find any reason to believe in what some historians say about the strict observance of purdāh.[162]

There are, no doubt, some examples of the observance of purdāh, but we should remember that it was of a very mild type. Bāṇa's words that "some (ladies) took the vow that they would see the face of none but of their husband,"[163] have no relation with the system of purdāh. By 'parpurusadarśana' Bāṇa simply indicates the unquestionable fidelity and undivided loyalty of wives towards their husbands. We are told in the Ratnāvalī that when the magician was ready to display his magical performance, the king asked to clear the palace of the people.[164] This was done to make the special arrangement for the ladies of the harem. Bāṇa informs us about the screened balcony which was occupied by the women of the family.[165] These evidences lead us to the conclusion that family privacy was duly preserved, but it cannot be maintained that strict purdāh was enforced. If there was any such system it was of a very mild and ordinary type. We should not confuse ourselves between the family privacy and the Purdāh system. The purdāh, as we find today, is difinitely the impact of the Muslim civilization.

---

159. *Ibid., Pp.* 141-142.
160. *Kādambarī, tr. Ridding, P.* 57.
161. *HCCTH., P.* 151.
162. *HMHI., I., P.* 97; *PO., Vol. XVI*, 1951, *P.* 106.
163. अधन्ये हतासि परपुरुषादर्शन व्रतेन —काद० संपा०, परब, पृ० १६६ ।
164. *Ratnāvalī, P.* 305.
165. *HCCTH., P.* 138.

FEMALE EDUCATION

Our sources throw much light on the female education. It was broad-based and aimed at the proper development of the ladies. They were given useful and necessary education and training and it was expected that it would enable them to be good housewives. Vātsyāyana gives us a list of sixty-four liberal arts and accomplishments that were prescribed for women.[166] Bāṇa informs us that Rājyaśrī "gradually grew up in increasing familiarity with friends expert in song, dance etc. and with all accomplishments."[167] Similar education and training was also given to Kādambarī. We are informed that the supposed daughter of Vindhyaketu was taught everyth ng that 'a noble damsel should know' (*viśiṣṭhakanyakochitaṁ*) i.e. singing (*gīta*), dancing (*nṛitya*), instrumental music (*vādya*) and other accomplishments. There are many other examples of girls getting proper education in those times.

THE CUSTOM OF SATĪ

The custom of Satī goes back to the age of Ṛigveda.[168] We have enough evidence on this point and we fail to understand as to why some scholars have tried to maintain that "the earliest notice of the self-immolation or the Satī occur in the Greek account of Alexander's invasion."[169] But this custom has undergone many changes in its practice and application and it has existed even to this day in some way or other inspite of legislation enacted in the time of Lord william Bentick.

During the post-vedic period this custom of Satī was reduced to a formality. We find it only in symbolic form. After the death of her husband a widow was expected to sit on the funeral pyre along with dead body of her husband. Then she was asked to come down by the younger

166. *Vātsyāyana's Kam.*, 1.3.

167. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 121; 'राज्यश्रीरपि नृत्यगीतादिषु विदग्धासु सखीषु सकलासु कलासु च प्रतिदिवसमुपचीयमानपरिचया शनैः शनैः —ह० च०, च० उ०, पृ० १२ ।

168. *VA.*, *P.* 390.

169. *Dr. A. L. Basham, The Wonder That Was India, P.* 187.

brother of the dead or his disciple or a servant. Thus it seems that the widow-burning was gradually reduced to a formality and people were satisfied with it. The wife of a deceased was to mount the funeral pyre and was asked to come down.[170] Thus it can be safely concluded that it had merely a ritualistic importance. This formality worked as a substitute for actual burning of a widow. But this custom seems to have continued among certain tribes and during certain periods.

We find its revival and prevalence during the age of Imperial Guptas and it also continued afterwards. The Eran stone pillar inscription offers the first epigraphic evidence of the Satī custom in the beginning of the sixth century A.D..[171] Satī custom continues down to the present times and we hear of voluntary widow-burning now and then.

During the age of Harṣa we find many examples of Satī. As the husband was the supreme lord of the wife, she did not see any usefulness in continuing her mortal existence after her husband was no more. When king Prabhākaravardhana was on the death-bed, queen Yaśomatī was very much grieved. Overcome with excessive and unbearable sorrow, she plunged into fire to avoid widowhood.[172] Even Harṣa's affectionate requests, persuasions and pitious cries failed to dissuade her from the firm determination of ending her life. After the treacherous assassination of Grahavarman, Rājyaśrī, his devoted wife, prepared to enter the funeral pyre. She told Harṣa, "A husband or a son is a woman's true support; but to those who are deprived of both, it is immodesty even to continue to live as mere fuel to the fire of misery."[173] Her decision was changed only after the persuasions of the great Buddhist sage Divākaramitra. After Jīmūtavāhana's death Malayavatī asked for the crown of her deceased lord so that "clasping it to her heart she might enter into the funeral pyre."[174]

---

170. *HS.*, *Pp.* 440-41.
171. *K. D. Bajpai*, *Sagar Through The Ages*, *P.* 14.
172. *HCCTH.*, *Pp.* 154-55; *HCK.*, *Canto* 5, *Pp.* 30-31.
173. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 254; अबलानां हि पतिरपत्यं वावलम्बनम्।...केवलम्।
—हृ० च०, अ० उच्छ्०, पृ० ८३।
174. *Nāgānandam*, *P.* 146. देहि मे आर्यपुत्रस्य चूडारत्नं येनेदं हृदयेकृत्वा ज्वलन प्रवेशेनात्मनः संतापभयनयामि।

Victorious Vijayasena gives an account of his invasion against Vindhyaketu and informs the king Udayana of the scene at the latter's capital. He tells that his (*Vindhyaketu's*) faithful wives (*sahadharmachāriṇīṣu*) had followed him in death. It is quite certain that they committed Satī. When Mahāśvetā found that Puṇḍarīka was dead, she asked her friend Tārālikā to rise and collect the wood to make a funeral pyre so that she might follow her lord.[175] Likewise, we find Kādambarī who "decided to embrace death, honouring the feet of Chandrapīḍa with bent head" and "placing them in her lap."[176] It seems that several wives of king Prabhākaravaradhana also committed Satī. Bāṇa informs us that after Prabhākaravardhana's death only a few sorrow-stricken chamberlains were left in the women's apartment.[177] We know definitely that the king had many other queens. They might have burnt themselves in order to commit Satī.

To commit Satī, a lady used to burn herself with all ornaments on her body and other marks and symbols of unwidowhood. She used to die either on the same funeral pyre on which her deceased husband lay or on another one prepared for her. In the absence of the bier of the husband, she carried with her the picture of her husband, representing the latter. She is said to have paid her reverence to all other belongings of the husband.[178]

---

175. *Kādambarī, tr. Ridding, P.* 133. उत्तिष्ठ काष्ठान्याहृत्य विरच्य चिताम्। ...अनुसरामि जीवितेश्वरम्। —काद०, संपा० परब, पृ० ३५७।

176. *Ibid., P.* 195. *Kādambarī later changed her decision when she was asked by a voice from the sky.*

177. *HCCTH., P.* 160.

178. *HCCTH., Pp.* 150-151.

CHAPTER X

SOCIETY (CONTINUED)

FOOD AND DRINK

Yuan Chuang writes that "milk, ghee, granulated sugar, sugar-candy, cakes and parched grain with mustard seed oil were the common food of the people."[1] They occasionally ate fish, mutton, venison as dainties.[2] Thus people were both vegetarian and non-vegetarian. Brāhmaṇas observed purity in their food. They did not attend the common dinner (*Vivarjitajanapaṅktyāḥ*) Some of them had stopped to take food even with three higher "Varṇas" (*Varṇatrayavyāvrittivisudhānahsaḥ*). But this restriction was not observed strictly in certain extra-ordinary conditions.

People observed complete cleanliness in their food habits. Among higher Varṇas a certain code of conduct was in practice. Yuan Chuang says, "Before every meal they must have a wash.... ; the food utensils are not passed on; those utensils which are of pottery or wood must be thrown away after use."[3] Here the pilgrim appears as partly correct. So far as clay-pots are concerned they might have been thrown off, but wooden pots might have been washed after use. Other utensils were of gold, copper, silver, and iron. After meal "people chew tooth-stick and make themselves clean."[4] We have already seen that people were both vegetarian and non-vegetarian. Yet it is difficult for us to draw a line of demarcation between vegetarians and non-vegetarians. Animal sacrifice was prevalent even among Brāhmaṇas. Both Baṇa and Yuan Chuang agree in this respect. The pilgrim records that "Fish, mutton, venison were

---

1. *Watters, I. P.* 178.
2. *Ibid., I, P.* 178.
3. *Ibid., P.* 152.
4. *Ibid., P.* 152.

occasionally taken." He adds, "The flesh of oxen, asses, elephants, horses, dogs, wolves, foxes, lions, monkeys and apes was forbidden and those who used such food became pariahs."[5]

The people were "unostentatious and simple in their way of taking food; they took their food with their fingers; spoons and chop-sticks were not in vogue, except in the cases of sickness."

In the mountainous regions and hermitages sages and ṛiṣis ate edible roots, fruits, herbs and other jungle fruits. In the Kādambarī and Harsacharita we find a number of such instances and it is not possible to quote them all.

WINE-DRINKING

Intoxicating drinks are common to all ages. During Harṣa's times, we are on definite grounds that wine-drinking was in vogue. It appears to have been a very common drink. Yuan Chuang tries to make certain distinctions in the use of wines and other beverages. According to him, "the Buddhist monks and Brāhmaṇas did not take wine; they took syrup of grapes and of sugarcane. The Ksatriyas took wine prepared of grapes and sugarcane." The Vaiśyas drank "a strong distilled spirit"; but the Śūdras and mixed and low castes were "without any distinguishing drink."[6] Bāṇa informs us that there were public drinking-saloons (*āpānamaṇḍapaṁ*) where people took wine freely.[7] At the birth celebrations of Harṣa wine is said to have been flown in streams where "in overwhelming joy the wise forgot themselves as they were intoxicated."[8] Among several things which were sent as presents by the king Bhāskaravarman of Kāmarūpa there were pitchers of very sweet wine.[9] At Vasantotsava and other

---

5. *Watters., I, P.* 178.

6. *Ibid., Life P.* 43. *It records that when Yuan Chwang refused to take wine he was offered the juice of grapes. Life, P.* 43.

7. *HCCTH., P.* 55.

8. *Ibid., P.* 115. *also P.* 111. *Bāṇa says that it was not possible to distinguish between drunk and sober (Durjñeyamattamattapravibhāgaḥ).*

9. *Ibid., P.* 214. अतिमधुरमधुरसामोदनिर्हारिणीर्वोल्लककलशीः

—हृ० च०, स० उच्छ्०, पृ० १२१

festivals people drank to their satisfaction and enjoyed the company of their mistresses.[10] Women also shared such drinks. Bāṇa, while speaking about the women of Sthāṇīśvara, says that "their faces were brilliant with white teeth, yet their breath was perfumed with fragrance of wine."[11] The government seems to have encouraged wine-drinking. At the marriage ceremony of Rājyaśrī leather-workers (*charmakārāḥ*) were treated with wine and they are described to have been "wild with intoxication."[12]

BETEL-CHEWING (TĀMBŪLASEVANA)

The habit of betel-chewing has been quite common among the Indians for about more than three thousand years. Even Chārvāka mentions the use of betel. In our ancient literature we find various customs associated with the use of betel such as exchange of Tāmbūla as a sign of betrothal, as a token of honour, as a token of vow or pledge or as a token of love etc.. Bṛihatsamhitā says about betel that "it stimulates love, gives physical charm, creates popularity, gives good smell to the mouth, strengthens the body and despels diseases arising from the phlegm."[13] There are thirteen recognized qualities of Tāmbūla.[14] Vātsyāyana, too, discusses the technique of offering a betel.[15] There are two separate works on Tāmbūla[16] which reflect on the social and cultural significance of the habit of betel-chewing.

During the times of Harsa betel-chewing was a very common habit. Guests were often entertained with betels.[17] It was a token of

10. *Ratnāvalī, Act. II.*, *P.* 38; *Nāgānandam*, *P.* 83.
11. *HCCTH.*, *Pp.* 82-83. धवलद्विजशुचिवदना मदिरामोदिश्वसनाश्च, —ह० च०, तृ० उच्छ०, पृ० ४४।
12. *Ibid.*, *P.* 123. लब्धमधुमदप्रचण्डचर्मकाराः। —ह० च०, च० उ०, पृ० १३।
13. *Bṛahatsamhitā.*, 77.35 *quoted in PO.*, *Vol. XIV*, 1949. *P.* 84.
14. *ABORIP.*, *Vol. XXXI*, 1951, *Pp.* 138-142.
15. *Kāmasūtra of Vātsyāyana*, *N. S. Press. Ed.*, *P.* 266.
16. *They are : Tāmbūlamañjarī and Tāmbula-kalpa-samgraha. The first is published by J. A. Pade in JOIB.*
17. *Nāgānandam*, *P.* 75, *Kādambarī*, *tr. Ridding*, *P.* 150.

love, honour and favour.[18] There was no prescribed time for betel-chewing. It seems that from morning to evening people used to eat betel, whenever they felt the necessity of it.[19] But people did not like to chew the betels in times of sorrow and misery. Bāṇa says that after Prabhākaravardhana's death, Harṣa did not take betel. His lower lip is said to have remained unstained by betel.[20] After Chandrapīḍa's death, Kādambarī is said to have rubbed off the deep stain of betel from her lips.[21]

Both males and females were employed as betel-bearers. The male was called Tāmbūladāyaka while the female betel-bearer was called Tāmbūlakaraṁkavāhinī; they both enjoyed an important position at courts and palaces. The tāmbūladāyaka of Grahavarman, named Pārijātaka, was deputed to Prabhākaravardhana to inform about the arrival of the marriage party and convey his master's greeting.[22] There was one Tāmbūladāyaka, named Chaṇḍaka in the company of Bāṇa. It seems that Tāmbūladāyakāḥ formed a particular class. At king's palaces, we generally find ladies entrusted with this work. Each member of the royal families had one betel-bearer (*Tāmbūlakaraṁkavāhinī*), who accompanied her master or mistress like a shadow. Rājyavardhana was followed by his betel-bearer even during his expedition against the Hūṇas;[23] and Bhaṇḍī is said to have used betel, though carelessly, even amidst the horrors of war.[24]

Tāmbūlakaraṁkavāhinī was the most trusted and honoured maid-servant of the palaces. We find that Tārālikā, Mahāśvetā's betel-bearer, helped Mahāśvetā in her secret communication with Puṇḍarīka.[25] Vaiśa-

---

18. *Kādambarī, tr. Ridding, P.* 172; *THK., P.* 331.

19. *HCCTH., P.* 79.; *Kādambarī, Pp.* 14, 102; *HCCTH., P.* 72.

20. *HCCTH., P.* 161. उद्‌गिरत्सताम्बूलस्य, —हु० च०, पं० उच्छ्०, पृ० ३४ ।

21. *Kādambarī, P.* 198; *Kādambarī, Ed. Parab, P.* 637; *HCCTH., Pp.* 138., 143; *HCK., Can.* 5, *Pp.* 22, 25.

22. *HCCTH., P.* 126.

23. *HCCTH., Pp.* 165-166.

24. *HCCTH., P.* 223.

25. *Kādambarī, tr. Ridding., Pp.* 149-50.

mpāyana was brought to the inner apartment of the palace by Śūdraka's betel-bearer. Sometimes high-born princesses of conquered kings were also appointed as betel-bearers.[26] They also waved the Chowries.[27] Betel-bearers of the princesses sometimes accompanied them to their husband's homes and acted as their sincere and trusted friends. Rājyaśrī's betel-bearer, Patralatā accompanied her to the Vindhya forest. She is represented by Bāṇa as the most affectionate friend of Rājyaśrī. What Rājyaśrī desired to say to Harṣa she whispered it in the ear of her Tāmbūlakaraṁkavāhinī.[28] It obviously indicates that they were on the most intimate terms. It is surprising that Yuan Chuang does not particularly mention the habit of betel-chewing among the Indians. He only says, "They stain their teeth red or black."[29] These "red or black" teeth were, most probably, due to the constant use of betel.

DRESS AND ORNAMENTS

Yuan Chuang and Bāṇa give contradictory accounts about the clothing and dress of the people. It is difficult to understand the former when he says, "The inner clothing and the outward attire of the people have no tailoring."[30] I am surprised to note that some scholars also agree to what the pilgrim says and conclude that upto the days of Harṣa tailoring had not yet been introduced into India.[31] We have definite proofs that tailoring was known to the people of India prior to the age of Harṣa. Kālidāsa refers to several dresses which are unthinkable without tailoring. Vārabāṇa (*a coat-like wearing cloth*) and Kañchukas were familiar to him. He mentions them very often.[32] In the time of Kuṣaṇas we have several examples of tailored clothes in sculpture. We find mention of 'payodha-

---

26. *Ibid.*, P. 75.
27. *HCCTH.*, P. 202.
28. *HCCTH.*, P. 254.
29. *Watters, I, P.* 151.
30. *Watters, I, P.* 148.
31. *HMHI.*, *I, P.* 89.
32. *Raghuvaṁśa.*, 4. 55.

ravasana'[33] (*choli-like cloth for women*) in various other works which can be traced back even to many centuries before the Christian Era.

We are told in the Mahābhārata that the Pāṇḍavas were refused to be granted the land equal to the point of a needle (*sūchyāgra*). What was this needle for ? Most probably, it might have been used in sewing. So far as Bāṇa is concerned, he definitely mentions the clothes which required tailoring.[34] While describing some clothes of the kings and nobles, Bāṇa mentions the following clothes.

(1) Trousers[35] are generally of three kinds viz., Svasthāna, Pingā and Satulā.

(2) Coats are of four types viz., Kañchuka, Chīnacholaka, Vārabāṇa and Kūrpāśaka.[36]

These clothes cannot be imagined without expert tailoring. It is also obvious from the Ajantā paintings that tailoring was a fine art. The pilgrim himself mentions that "in North India, where the climate is very cold, closely fitting jackets are worn." I do not understand how these "closely fitting jackets" could have been made without tailoring. They must have required tailoring.

IMPORTANCE OF WHITE COLOUR

Both Yuan Chuang and Bāṇa give somewhat similar accounts of the importance that was attached to the use of white colour. The pilgrim says, "As to colour a fresh white is esteemed."[37] Bāṇa supports the pilgrim and we gather from his writings that white colour was regarded as an auspicious colour and almost all the people preferred it to other colours. Several examples of the use of white colour can be given from the writings of Bāṇa.

---

33. *Ibid*, 4. 55.

34. *Women of Sthāṇvīśvara wore Kañchukī or Cholī. HCCTH., P.* 83; *HCK., Canto*, 3. *P.* 44.

35. *HCCTH., P.* 202. *Trousers came into vogue during the times of Śakas. HCESA., Pp.* 148-49.

36. *Ibid., Pp.* 150-153.

37. *Watters, I, P.* 148.

At the consecration ceremony Chandrapīḍa was adorned with white silken robes, and even the flowers that were gathered for the purpose were white. His body was consecrated with wreaths of white flowers.[38] When he was going on an expedition he was accompanied by Vaiśampāyana who was also clothed in white, anointed with an ointment of white flowers and even the colour of his umbrella was white.[39] Puṇḍarīka's face was adorned with white tilaka.[40] The wandering ascetic women (*parivrājikāḥ*) bore the marks of white ashes on their foreheads. They wore both white and red clothes and had with them fans of white cloth (*śvetapaṭavyajanāni*).[41] Bāṇa himself put on white clothes before he started to see his monarch Harṣa[42] and he decked himself with white unguents and wore white garlands and white garments.[43] Even the royal umbrellas (insignia of royalty) were of white colour.[44] The turban of Pāriyātra, the chief door-keeper of Harṣa, who received Bāṇa first, was white.[45] Brāhmaṇas often wore white clothes. Bāṇa informs us that the white-clad Brāhmaṇas came to the palace of king Prabhākaravardhana at the time of the birth of Harṣa.[46] But white colour was also liked by widows. Bāṇa mentions that after Prabhākaravardhana's death "earth looked as if it had arrayed herself in white robes."[47] After Chandrapīḍa's death, Kādambarī put on two white robes.[48]

---

38. *Kādambarī, tr. Ridding, Pp.* 84-85.
39. *Ibid., P.* 87.
40. *Ibid., P.* 105.
41. *Ibid., P.* 162.
42. *HCCTH., P.* 44. 'धृतधौतधवलदुकूलवासा:' —हु० च०, द्वि० उच्छ०, पृ० २५ ।
43. *HCCTH., P.* 44. 'शुक्लांगराग:, शुक्लमाल्य:, शुक्लवासा:,' —हु० च०, द्वि० उ०, पृ० २५ ।
44. *HCCTH., P.* 47.
45. *Ibid., P.* 50.
46. *HCCTH., P.* 111.
47. *HCCTH., P.* 159. परिधत्तां धवले वाससी वसुमती। —हु० च०, पं० उ०, पृ० ३३ ।
48. *Kādambarī, P.* 198, *also P.* 47.

But Yuan Chuang is again somewhat misled when he says that "motley is of no account."[49] We know it definitely that people were also fond of different colours. Bāṇa mentions five chief colours, at least, when he describes that the threads of wool of five colours (*Pañcharāgāḥ*) were hanging near the ears of the camel.[50] He frequently mentions a number of different varieties of colour-tints and some mixed tints, prepared by mixing primary colours.[51] He also gives us a vivid account of the dyeing and colouring of different clothes on the occasion of Rājyaśrī's marriage. We are informed that some clothes were being dyed by the washermen and some were dyed by the old and expert ladies who were employed at the palace. After the dying was over the dyed clothes were shaken by servants holding them at either end, and were dried up in the shade.[52] We are also informed about variegated and multi-coloured cotton and silken clothes.[53]

The pilgrim is correct to a great extent when he gives further description about dress. "The men wind a strip of cloth round the waist and upto the armpits and leave the right shoulder bare. The women wear a long robe which covers both shoulders and falls down loose. The hair on the crown of the head is made into a coil, all the rest of the hair hanging down. Some clip their mustaches or have other fantastic fashions. Garlands are worn on the head and necklaces on the body."[54]

CLASSIFICATION OF CLOTHES

Both Yuan Chuang and Bāṇa give the sixfold classification of clothing materials.[55]

---

49. *Watters, Vol. I, P.* 148.
50. *HCCTH., P.* 47.
51. *JORM., Vol. VII*, 1933.
52. *HCCTH., P.* 125. बहुविधभक्ति...शुष्कस्य —ह०च०, च०उ०, पृ० १४।
53. *HCCTH., P.* 125.
54. *Watters, I. P.* 148.
55. *Ibid., I, P.* 148; *HCESA., P.* 76.

(1) The first is Kausheya (*Kiao-she-ye*). It was also called Lājāntaka and Patrorṇa. It was costly silk which was very common among the rich families and was prepared from a wild silk-worm.

(2) Kshauma (*Ch'u-mo*). It was a kind of linen. The word '*Ch' u-mo*' is used for "cloth made from the Chinese Boehmeria nivea." This material, in the form of "finished articles, resembles linen but is softer and looks fluffier."[56]

(3) Muslin (*tieh*). Bāṇa's anśuka is the same for which Yuan Chuang gives the term 'tieh.' This was very common in India among the rich people and princely classes at least. Bāṇa mentions Chīnāṅśuka i.e. aṅśuka (*Muslin*) brought from China.

The next three kinds of clothing material are :—Calico (*Pu*), Kambala (*Han-po-lo*) and Ho-la-li (*Ral* ?), a texture made from wool. According to Watter's remark, it denotes Rallaka, a wild animal and a stuff made from its hair. Rallaka-Kambala is a fine woollen cloth.[57] The rest of Bāṇa's three kinds are dukūla, netra and stavaraka. Dukūla is also used as dugūla which was manufactured in Puṇḍravardhana Bhukti (*North Bengal*).[58] This cloth was used for different ordinary and common purposes by all the classes of people. The second was netra to which there are many references.[59] Stavaraka was used for the marriage Puṇḍāla of Rājyaśrī.[60]

DRESS AND ORNAMENTS OF KINGS

Here, too, the poet and the pilgrim give us somewhat identical accounts. "The dress and ornaments of the kings and grandees are very extraordinary." Garlands and "tiaras with precious stones are their

---

56. *Vivi Sylwan, Investigatiom of Silk from Edsen-Col and Lop-nor, Stolkholm*, 1949, *P.* 71, *quoted in HCESA., P.* 76.

57. *Watters, I, P.* 149.

58. *HCESA., P.* 77.

59. *Ibid., P.* 78; *Dr. Motichandra, Prāchīna Bhāratīya Veśabhūṣā, P.* 157.

60. *HCESA., Pp.* 80-1.

head-adornments;" and their bodies "are adorned with rings, bracelets and necklaces."[61]

SOME VARIED DESCRIPTION OF COSTUMES GIVEN BY THE CHINESE PILGRIM

Acording to Yuan Chuang, "the garbs of the non-Buddhist are varied and extraordinary." Some people "wear peacock's tails." This is probably about the Jains.[62] Some "adorn themselves with a necklace of skulls;"[63] some are "quite naked;"[64] some cover the body with "grass or boards"; some "pull out their hair and clip their moustaches;"[65] some "mat their side-hair and make a top-knot coil."[66] This description of the Chinese traveller seems to be true about the people of different sects and schools of India. What Yuan Chuang writes about the seventh century India can also be seen today. India is a land of diversified sects and cults and the colourful costume is there because of them.

ORNAMENTS

There is traditional fondness for ornaments in India. Indian ladies are very fond of ornaments and in that period, too, we find them with numerous ornaments. They adorned their limbs with several ornaments.[67] Description of these ornaments is found in certain passages

---

61. *Watters, I, P.* 151. *Similar account is given by Bāṇa when he describes the costume and robes of Prabhākaravardhana, Harṣa, Tārāpīḍa and Chandrapīḍa and other high-born male characters.*

62. *We find similar description of the Jain monks in Bāṇa's accounts.*

63. *This must have reference to Pāśupatas.*

64. *It may, most probably, refer to the Jain sādhus.*

65. *This must have reference to the "Keśaluñchakas" of the Jain sect.*

66. *Watters, I, P.* 148; *Some of these peculiar ornamentations and dresses were also prevalent among Śabaras and the people of mountainous regions. Several Indian sādhus must have also lived in this manner.*

67. *Nāgānand, II.* 13.; *Ratnāvalī, I.* 17., *also Pp.* 67-70, 77; *Kādambarī, tr. Ridding, P.* 87.

and stanzas of Harṣa's dramas and Bāṇa's works which we propose to mention here.

In the Mimic Play in the Priyadarśikā we are told of the members of the retinue of the queen. Their legs (*pādaiḥ*) are adorned with anklets (*nūpuribhiḥ*); their broad-hips with tinkling girdle bands (*nitambaphalakaiḥ siñjānakāñchiguṇaiḥ*); their swelling bosoms with the loveliness of necklaces (*hārādi*); their ears with rings (*Kuṇḍalibhiḥ*); their arms with armlets (*Savalayaiḥ*) and their hair with Svastikas.[68]

There is another stanza in the Nāgānandam which is worth quoting. To Malayavatī, who was well adorned with many ornaments, her maid tells, "The weight of thy swelling breast was enough for thy slender waist to bear, then why this superfluous necklace ? The thighs are already sagging under thy massive hips, why need this girdle ? Thy feet can hardly carry thy plump thighs, how could they, these additional anklets ? Thy limbs are themselves more than ornaments for thee, then why bear an extra burden of trinkets to irk thyself." ?[69]

Necklace was one of the the most famous and commonly used ornaments. It was of pearls[70] (*muktāhāra or ratnamālā*), of lotus-shoots,[71] of gold (*svarṇahāra*).[72] The females of all classes wore the necklaces which their husbands could afford.

Some auspicious ornaments are also mentioned which were used by Hindu ladies who had their husband's[73] alive;[74] and after their husband's death they gave up all those adornments.[75] There are certain other ornaments which are separately mentioned by Bāṇa. Trikaṇṭakas were made

---

68. *Priya.*, *P.* 50
69. *Nāgā.*, 3. 6.
70. *Nāgā, II*, 12; *Ratnāvali, Pp.* 25, 276, 318.
71. *Ratnā.*, *P.* 164.
72. *Ratnā.*, *P.* 140, 77, 214.
73. *Yaśomatī put on all these ornaments before she plunged into funeral pyre.*
74. *Priya.*, *P.* 20.
75. *Kādambarī, tr. Ridding*, *P.* 199.

of conical jewels with three stones set therein. Dantapatras were coloured blue. Lalāṭikā, Pulakabandha and Tilakabindu are also mentioned in Bāṇa's works. These ornaments were put on by the ladies of his times.

There were other various fashions among the ladies. They used to redden their lips with lip-stick made of lac. This is very clear when Bāṇa says that the dreadful forest conflagration sometimes looked like women's lower lips reddened with melted lac (*lākṣā*).[76] Similarly young ladies also coloured their feet. Bāṇa takes us to the scene of celebrations at the time of Harṣa's birth-day. He tells us of the "tripping feet" of the dancing women "a dew of lac-reddened sweat that besprinkled the palace haṁsas, resembled moonlight night when the twilight casts a glow upon the moon's disks." He further tells us that the earth was crimsoned by the trickling lac of the feet of the women who were dancing at the birth celebrations.[77] He pathetically describes the wanderings of Rājyaśrī whose "feet were red, as with the customary lac, through the blood pouring from the wounds made by the hard spikes of Darbhā grass."[78] The feet of the ladies "looked roseate with fresh lac."[79] This fashion of colouring the feet was particularly significant among the mistresses of the Siddhas and Vidyādharas.[80]

People also adorned their pet and domestic animals. The elephants, horses, and camels were adorned; their mouths were ornamented with the lines of cowries, ears with red cowries and with the strings of ever-shining golden ornaments. Coloured threads of wool were also

---

76. *HCCTH., P.* 39; क्वाचिद्विलीनलाक्षारसलोहितच्छवयो धरा: । *HCK., Can* 2, *P.* 23.

77. *HCCTH., P.* 115; कान्चिच्चलच्चरणच्युतालक्तकारुणस्वेदशीकरसिच्यमानभवनहंसा: संध्यारागरज्यमानेन्दुबिम्बा इव कौमुदीरजन्य: ।

—हु० च, च० उ०, पृ० १ ।

78. *HCCTH., P.* 242; कठोरदर्भांकुरक्षतक्षारिणा क्षतजेनानुसरणालक्तकेनेव रक्तचरणाम् । —हु० च०, अ० उ०, पृ० ७६ ।

79. *Kādambari, tr. Ridding, Pp.* 66-77.

80. *HCCTH., P.* 10; *In the Nāgānandaṁ we find the red footprints of the Siddha women walking on the pearly rocks of Malaya Mountain.*

fastened on their foreheads. Bells were hung round the neck of the cows and the buffaloes.[81]

BATH, TOILET AND INDIVIDUAL CLEANLINESS

People in those times maintained a high standard of cleanliness and observed a very refined code of neatness. Both Bāṇa and Yuan Chuang give many details about their bodily cleanliness. We have already referred to Bāṇa's description and the informations of the pilgrim supplement to his evidence. He tells us that the Brāhmaṇas and Kṣatriyas were "clean-handed, unostentatious, pure and simple in life."[82] The pilgrim further records that they (*all people*) are "pure of themselves and not from compulsion."[83] "Before every meal they must have wash (*bath*)." We are told, "People cleaned their mouth as soon as their meal was over." The pilgrim records, "They chew tooth-stick and make themselves clean,"[84] and it is certain that each individual was very careful about his personal hygiene. They came into contact with each other only after they finished ablutions. Bath was necessarily taken after urination. People extensively used "scented unguents such as sandal and saffron."[85] This was mainly done in order to maintain physical purity and to add substance to bodily charm.

LIFE OF THE TRIBAL PEOPLE

Both Kādambarī[86] and Harṣacharita[87] provide us with a picturesque

---

81. *HCCTH., Pp.* 46-47, 79. *Today also we find these fashions in vogue among Rājās and Mahārājās who adorn their horses and elephants. Cows and bullocks are commonly adorned by all classes of people on festivals.*

82. *Watters, Vol. I, P.* 151.

83. *Ibid., Vol. I, P.* 152.

84. *Ibid., P.* 152. *About the use of tooth-sticks we find some verses in Bṛihat Saṁhitā., LXXXV.* 1-7.

85. *Watters, Vol. I, P.* 152; *HCCTH., P.* 17; *Nag., III.* 9; *Kādambarī, tr. Ridding., P.* 84.

86. *Kādambarī, tr. Ridding, Pp.* 26-32; *KP., Pp.* 61-72.

87. *HCCTH., Pp.* 230-233.

description of the Śabaras. It brings before us the complete picture of the way of life that was led by the jungle tribes and backward classes of the people of those areas. They were wandering tribes and their main occupation was hunting. They used bows and swords in hunting. Their arrows were most powerful and the points of them were poisonous. The end of the sword was anointed with quicksilver and its handle was made of polished horn. The swords were wrapped in a short black antelope skin and seaths were adorned with the spotted skin of a Chitraka snake. Thus it is clear that even serpents were not excluded in hunting. These people used to seize the tusks of elephants and long-haired yaks. They kept vessels of water and honey with them. They ate both raw (Unroasted) and roasted meat. Skins of lions were collected by them and were used for decorative purposes. These people took with them peacock's tails and crow's feathers. They were dirty in their daily living habits.

They possessed thatched cottages and were loyal to their chief. They were extremely superstitious and their gods and goddesses received the offering of flesh. Sometimes human flesh was also offered. Yuan Chuang was once caught by some jungle tribes and was to be offered to the goddess but was luckily saved just before he was to be offered to the goddess of these tribes. Durgā or Chaṇḍī was their supreme deity.

MEANS OF AMUSEMENT AND FESTIVITIES

It is quite interesting to describe the various means of amusement and delight which existed in India where the whole genius of a people from the simple-minded peasant to the philosophical-minded metaphysician devoted his entire energy of both body and mind to the attainment of salvation. Yet this above-mentioned generalization must be accepted only with some reservation. Man also requires ease and comforts and wants to amuse himself when he frees himself from the hard tasks of life. Various means of getting pleasure and happiness do exist for man in all times. We try to get enjoyment from the things around us. During all the ages and at all the places we find various means of recreation and amusement. Many such means were also common during the age of Harṣavardhana.

RECREATIONS FOR CHILDREN

Children used to play and make merry with domestic birds. In the Kādambarī we find an interesting story of a marriage of a Sārikā, named Kālinī, with a parrot named Parihāsa. They were affectionately loved by Kādambarī who gave Kālinī in marriage to Parihāsa.[88] There were various means of recreations and amusements provided at the royal guest-house where Chandrāpīḍa was staying.[89] The celebration of marriages of birds, plants and creepers was a very common type of recreation among the children. Kādambarī, who was meditating to embrace death, asks Mahāśvetā to wed the young mango to the creeper named Mādhavī.[90] Birds were caught and were put in beautiful cages and the children played with them even as they advanced in age. Kādambarī asks her friend Mahāśvetā to set free the Mainā and the parrot and the ape and to give Tārālikā, a fawn to a hermitage. Then she asks about the Haṁsa and other domestic belongings.[91]

For the grown-up people of all classes there were many means of recreation which we shall discuss below.

MAGIC

Magic seems to have been very common and it was one of the most popular means of amusement among the people of Northern India. Yuan Chuang describes about the people of Sthānvīśvara that they were "greatly devoted to magical arts and hightly prized outlandish accomplishment."[92] Among the friends of Bāna there was one Karāla who was a distinguished magician (*mantrasādhaka*). Another friend, Chakorākṣa, was a juggler or an illusionist (*Aindrajālikaḥ*).[93] The art of magic was so much advanced that the fourth act of the Ratnāvalī is named Aindrajālika."[94]

88. *Kādambarī, tr. Ridding, Pp.* 150-151.
89. *Kādambarī, tr. Ridding, P.* 152.
90. *Ibid., P.* 194.
91. *Ibid., P.* 94-95.
92. *Watters, I, P.* 314.
93. *HCCTH., P.* 33; *HCK., P.* 19.
94. *Aindrajālikonāmaka Aṅkaḥ, Rat., P.* 358.

In the Ratnāvalī we meet a magician who is said to have come from Ujjayinī. He is introduced to the king by Kāñchanamālā. The king is said to have been extremely interested in magic and the magician was ordered to arrive quickly. The magician had with him the peacock feathers.

After saluting the king the magician requested the king to order him to exhibit his feats of magic. The verse is important for it indicates the various illusory appearances which the magician could display. The magician requested the king to be ordered to produce the moon (*Mṛigāṅka*) on the earth or hills (*Mahīdharāḥ*) in the sky (*Ākāśe*) or fire (*Jvalanaḥ*) in water or dusk (*Pradoṣaḥ*) at noon (*Madhyāhne*).[95] The former promised the king that through the power of his preceptor's incantation (*Mantra*) he would show whatever the latter wished at heart to see.[96] Thus it seems that the art of magic was taught by noted magicians to their disciples and the latter were very proud of the power of their preceptor's incantations. Before the imperial presence the magician displayed his multifarious feats at which the king expressed his wonder and asked the queen also to see them. We are told that the magician showed Brahmā in the sky on his lotus (*Saroje*), Śaṅkara with a digit of the moon (*rajanīkara*) on his crest, Viṣṇu or the slayer of the demons (*daityāntakaḥ*), indicated by the four hands, distinguished by bow, sword, lotus and discus (*Chakra*).[97] The king and the queen saw nearby the lord of the gods (*Tridaśapati i.e. Indra*), seated on Airāvata and other gods. They also witnessed celestial nymphs (*divyanāryāḥ*) dancing with anklets jingling on their restless feet.

This display was interrupted by the sudden appearance of Vasundharā who brought the news of the arrival of Vasubhūti, the Prime Minister of Vikramabāhu, the king of Ceylon. The magician was not very happy for one of his tricks remained unseen which the king promised to witness

---

95. *Ratnāvalī. P.* 141 'किं धरण्यां मृगांकमाकाशे महीधरो जले ज्वलनः।
मध्याह्ने प्रदोषो दर्श्यतां देह्याज्ञप्तिम्॥८॥
96. *Ibid., P.* 141 मम प्रतिज्ञैषा यद्यद् हृदयेनेहसे संद्रष्टुम्।
तत्तद्दर्शयाम्यहं गुरोर्मन्त्र प्रभावेण॥९॥
97. *Ratnāvalī*, 4. 10-11.

later. The fire, that broke out in the palace at the close of the fourth act of Ratnāvalī, was also conjured by the magician. It was one of his magical feats and not the actual fire.

GAMBLING

The princely people of the ancient times were much addicted to gambling. Even now semi-sacramental gambling is practised in many parts of India during religious festivals such as Divālī. In the Ṛigvedic hymns Indra is compared to a gambler, who, by superior play, wins advantages and piles his gains in seasons.[98] Thus we see that gambling existed even in the early Vedic age and continued even to this day. But it was not regarded as one of the noble means of enjoyment. Kauṭilya, who laid down rules to regularise gambling, says that, "of the addictions to gambling and women, gambling is more serious evil." It causes violation of duty and incapacity to deal with politics.[99] Kāmandaka also condemns gambling bitterly. According to him, "it causes loss of money, neglect of righteous ceremonies, separation from the company of the good, endless hostility, disregard of necessary duties and loss of prestige."[100]

This was also the view of the learned people of the age of Harṣa. In the Kādambarī, Śukanāsa, the prime minister of Tārāpīḍa, condemns gambling and advises Chandrapīḍa not to indulge in it.[101] But gambling was practised by the people of that period and we find a number of evidences to prove its existence.

Chandrapīḍa was taught in all the arts of gambling along with other branches of learning.[102] It seems that the sons of rich and wealthy people were given proper training at dice so that they might not be cheated in the gambling. Among the persons in the company of Bāṇa there was a gambler (*Kitavaḥ*), named Bhīmaka.[103] Bāṇa informs us that Sthāṇvī-

98. *Age of Mantras, P.* 56.
99. *Arthaśāstra, tr. by Śāmaśāstry, P.* 356.
100. *Kāmandakiya Nitisāra, P.* 212.
101. *Kādambarī, tr. Ridding, P.* 81.
102. *Kādambarī, tr. Ridding; P.* 60; सर्वासु द्यूत कलासु। काद०, संपा० परब, पृ० १६८
103. *HCCTH., P.* 33.

śvara was looked upon as a gambling-house by the bards.[104] But, as it is natural that honesty had hardly any place in the gambling, the people of that period employed some unfair means also while playing at dice. They are also said to be hardly grateful.[105]

CHESS

Perhaps the game of chess was introduced for the first time in the seventh century A.D. Chess as a game is first mentioned by Bāṇa in his Harṣacharita.[106] Mr. H. G. Rawlinson believes that the game found its way from India to Europe through the Arabs. The Sanskrit name of chess is Chaturaṅga and in Persian this became Shatarañja. Many of its terms, such as 'Checkmate (Shāh māt; the king is dead), and 'rook' (*rukh*) are of Persian origin.[107]

HUNTING

Kings and princes took much delight in hunting. It was one of the means of royal recreation. We are informed by Bāṇa that Harṣa followed Rājyavardhana when the latter was deputed on an expedition against the Hūṇas towards the north and that "being at youth's adventure-loving age, he (*Harṣa*) enjoyed several days away from the camp in hunting on the skirts of the Himālayas where lions, sharabhas and tigers were in plenty." Bāṇa describes Harṣa as a fawn-eyed hunter and with his bow drawn to the ear, he emitted rain of shining shafts which "in a comparatively few days left the forests empty of wild creatures."[108] Bāṇa provided us with another example of hunting. Prince Chandrapīḍa was extremely eager to go for hunting (*mṛigayā*). One day he is described to have got up before sunrise and with his father's permission he went to the woods with a great

104. *Ibid., P.* 82. द्यूतस्थानमिति बन्दिभिः *HCK., Can.* 3, *P.* 44.
105. *HCCTH., Pp.* 171-172. कितवः कृतज्ञः जगति दुर्लभः,
—ह० च०, ष० उ०, पृ० ४० ।
106. *HCCTH., P.* 6. अन्धकारितललाटपट्टाष्टापदा ।—ह०च०, प्र० उ०, पृ० ३ । *P.* 3. *Please also see note in the appendix B., P.* 266; *Legacy of India, P.* 23.
107. *The Legacy of India, "India in European Literature and Thought," P.* 23; *HCESA., P.* 14.
108. *HCCTH., P.* 132.

retinue of runners, horses and elephants. He slew wild bears, lions, yaks and many kinds of deer in thousands. He used arrows with shafts in hunting.

From the above accounts we can safely conclude that hunting was a great pastime for kings and princes. At the hunting encampment almost all palatial luxuries and comforts were provided. Chandrapīḍa was accompanied by a large number of attendants who looked after every thing. Arrangements were made for bathing, exercise, worship and all other matters of daily routine. At the hunting camp we find the court maidens appointed by the grand-chamberlain. Chandrapīḍa's father took special care in sending maid servants bearing different ornaments, wreaths, unguents and robes, which they presented to him. Betel-bearer (*tāmbūlakaraṅkavāhinī*) was also there in the camp.[109] Sometimes kings used their particular and favourite elephants or horses in hunting. Harṣa's elephant Darśapāta is said to be a friend of Harṣa in battle and sport (*Krīḍā*). Herein 'Krīḍā' stands for hunting.[110] Indrāyudha enjoyed the same status with Chandrapīḍa as Darśapāta received from Harṣa.

In spite of the fact that kings and princes enjoyed hunting, it seems that hunting was not looked upon as a good type of recreation. During the pre-Kauṭilyan days hunting was regarded as one of the fourfold vices,[111] but Kauṭilya recommends hunting as one of the royal pastimes. He says that "in hunting exercise, the disappearance of phlegm, bile, fat, and sweat, the acquisition of skill in aiming at stationary and moving bodies, the ascertainment of the appearance of beasts when provoked and occasional march are its good characteristics."[112] During the days of Harṣa hunting came to be regarded as an evil by the wise Brāhmaṇas, atleast. In the Kādambarī we find Śukanāsa advising prince Chandrapīḍa not to take delight in hunting when the latter's anointation was to be celebrated.[113]

---

109. *Kādambarī, tr. Ridding, Pp.* 73-75.
110. *HCCTH., P.* 51.
111. *Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra, P.* 355-56.
112. *Ibid., P.* 356.
113. *Kādambarī, tr. Ridding, P.* 81.

But Harṣa's participation in hunting and his selection of a particular elephant for it and the example of Chandrapīḍa's delightful indulgence in hunting lead us to conclude that kings, and members of the higher classes must have taken full delight in hunting.

Besides, Bāṇa informs us that Śabaras and other jungle tribes obtained their food through hunting. They ate the flesh of the animals by killing them and made some ornaments and decorations with their teeth, bones, skin, horns and bristles. Bāṇa's description of Vyāghraketu, the son of Śarabhaketu, a tributary chief of one of the regions of Vindhya forest, is extremely picturesque and significant. He had a bow and his chest was "broadened and hardened by incessantly bending it;" his "tin armlet was decorated with white godanta[114] beads (*maṇi*)"; "the back of his forearm was thickly covered by a mass of the roots of the Nāgadamana plant which was fastened together by the bristles of boars;"[115] he had "a sword and the end of it was anointed with quicksilver and its handle was made of polished horn;" it was "covered in a short black antelope skin and its sheath was adorned with the spotted skin of a Chitraka snake, placed between two strips of the skin of an Ahīrānī snake;" the youth had "a leather quiver on his back, made of a bear's skin, wrapped round with a spotted tiger skin;" he carried with him "a hunter's extemporised box of colours in a partridge;" his bow was "adorned with a profuse pigments of peacock's gall" and he had "a vikarṇa arrow, having its point dipped in a potent poison."[116]

Thus the picture of a typical hunter is beautifully drawn by Bāṇa, but we must note that hunting was one of the means of obtaining the livelihood for the forest people rather than a pastime. They regarded it as an occupation rather than as an enjoyment.

SOME ANNUAL AND SEASONAL FESTIVALS

Throughout the year the Hindus celebrate various festivals of which

---

114. *According to commentators it means "the head-gem of godanta serpent. HCK., Notes, Can.* 8, *P.* 216; *HCCTH., P.* 231.

115. *Ibid., P.* 231.

116. *HCK., Pp.* 70-71; *HCCTH., Pp.* 231-32.

some can be traced back to the Vedic age. These festivals existed throughout the ages and with some modifications they are celebrated even today. They are culturally very important and their socio-religious significance is easily understandable when we look back to their uninterrupted continuation. During the age of Harṣa people enjoyed some annual and seasonal festivities which throw light on the culture of that age.

MADANOTSAVA[117]

Of all the festivals Madanotsava was the most joyful and widely observed. It was celebrated once a year. The festivities of coming of the Spring (*Vasanta*) were celebrated on the full-moon day (*Pūrṇimā*) of the month of Chaitra but now it takes place on the full-moon day of Phālguna and it may be identified with the Hindu 'Holi' festival.[118] In Harṣa's Ratnāvalī we find a picturesque description of this festival of Cupid (*Madana*). It was celebrated at the royal palace. The king and the Jester are described to have come to attend the Vasantotsava in dresses suited to the spring festival.[119] This joyful festival was the gayest merriment. Sweet music and the sound of drums were heard on this occasion and heaps of scented powder were scattered about over the people. The yard is described to have been flooded all over with ceaseless flow of water poured by fountains.

On this occasion the play of love (*Madanalīlā*) was enacted by young ladies named Madanikā and Chaturikā. This enactment was highly praised by the king. It seems that men and women mixed in dancing. The Jester danced and sang with the maids. At this festival the queen worshipped Kāmadeva or Madana (the god of love) at the Makaranda garden (*Udyāna*).[120] The first act of the Ratnāvalī is named as

117. *It was also called Vasantotsava or Madanamahotsava.*

118. *Aple, Sanskrit English Dictionary, Poona,* 1890, *P.* 953; *Priya., Notes, P.* 98.

119. *Harṣa does not mention the particular form or colour of "the dresses befitting the spring festival," but most probably they might have been dyed in a saffron colour as the people do now-a-days.*

120. *Ratnā., Pp.* 31-38, 59-84.

"Madanamahotsava nāma prathamo-aṅkaḥ." and a drama was also enacted on the day of Vasantotsava.[121] Likewise, after the opening stanzas of the invocation of the Priyadarasikā we are informed by the stage-manager (*Sūtradhāra*) that it was the day of the spring festival (*Vasantotsava*) when the drama Priyadarśikā was staged.

KAUMUDĪMAHOTSAVA

The second important festival was Kaumudīmahotsava. It is perhaps synonimous with the grand autumnal celebration of the full-moon day of Āśvina (*September or October*). Now-a-days we call it the Śarata-Pūrṇimā festival. In the very beginning of the third act of the Priyadarśikā we find the reference of Kaumudīmahotsava, wherein Manorama, the maid of the queen Vāsavadattā, informs us that she and others of the queen's retinue were to perform the play which was composed by Sāṅkṛityāyanī about the adventure of the king and the queen[122]. In the fourth act the author also mentions about the previous performance of the mimic play on the day of Kaumudīmahotsava.[123]

UDAYANOTSAVA

The Udayana-festival appears to have been instituted to celebrate the capture of Udayana as it was associated with the winning of Vāsavadattā. This festival is not of much importance as it was associated with a particular incident of the life of King Udayana, the hero of both Ratnāvalī and Priyadarśikā. Such celebrations which follow some incidents are only of temporary importance and they cease to exist as the social festivals with the lapse of time. It also depends upon the importance of the person

---

121. *Ibid.*, *Pp.* 14-15. *Bāṇa also informs us of a Festival of Kāma for the sportive gambols of intoxication. HCCTH.*, *P.* 55; *Madanotsava Madanalilāsyānaṁ*. *HCK.*, *P.* 31. *It was also on the day of Madana Mahotsava that Kādambarī clasped Chandrāpīḍa's neck, as though he was not alive, and it was at her embrace the prince's life returned to him. Kādambarī, tr. Ridding, P.* 206.

122. *Priya.*, *Act.* 3, *P.* 38.

123. *Ibid.*, *P.* 72.

with whom it is related. We celebrate Daśaharā even today after many centuries as it is associated with Rāma's conquest over Rāvaṇa.

INDROTSAVA

It was a festival celebrated in the honour of Indra. On this occasion a great flag was hoisted and it was worshipped along with Indra, the god of gods. It is also mentioned in the Raghuvaṁśa of Kālidāsa[124], wherein we find that it was celebrated during the first half of the month of Bhādrapada. On this occasion plays were generally enacted. In the first chapter of Nāṭya Śāstra a reference is made to Indradhvaja and it appears that the first drama was enacted on that occasion.[125]

INSTITUTION OF PROSTITUTION

Reference about the prostitutes are few and it is difficult to delineate an exact nature of this institution as it existed during the period under review. But still, we have some positive proofs to conclude that the prostitutes were there in the society and their number was also not small. Bāṇa tells us that the Janapada of Sthāṇvīśvara was looked upon as an abode of Cupid (*Kāmāyatanaṁ*) by the prostitutes (*Vaiśyābhiḥ*).[126] This statement of Bāṇa contains two meanings, at least; firstly, it means that there were many prostitutes and secondly, that they were inclined to sexual proclivities.

Prostitutes were also employed at the royal palaces. Kauṭilya maintains that prostitutes (*rūpajīvā*) would attend the harem with personal cleanliness "effected by a fresh bath and with fresh garments and ornaments."[127] During the days of Harṣa we also find several prostitutes working in the harem of Prabhākaravardhana. Bāṇa informs us that it was very "difficult to distinguish between noble maidens and harlots" who were

---

124. *Raghuvaṁśa., IV.* 3.

125. *Priya., P.* 131.

126. *HCK., Can.* 3., *P.* 43 *and Notes on P.* 192. *Cowell and Thomas translate it as "lovers" retreat by the courtesans." HCCTH., P.* 82.

127. *Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra, P.* 40.

participating "equally" at the birth of prince Harṣa.[128] This, very clearly indicates that they were treated well at the royal palaces. But a pious and religious-minded king like Harṣa did not indulge in prostitution. Bāṇa informs us that Harṣa was characterised as a deceiver (*dhūrta*) by the harlots (*Vaiśyābhiḥ*).[129] But from Bāṇa's own experience, we can gather that common people enjoyed the company of prostitutes. He unhesitatingly mentions two women who were associated with him for a long time as his friends. One of them was a dancing girl (*Nartakī*) named Hariṇikā and the other was Kuraṅgikā.

We are left with no accounts to infer anything positively whether the institution of prostitution existed during the days of Harṣa as it was in Kauṭilya's days[130] or not; but from the various duties at the court that were assigned to maidens only, it seems that the Kauṭilyan instructions were observed during this period. In the Arthaśāstra it is maintained that the prostitutes should hold the royal umbrella, golden pitcher and fan, and attend to king seated on his royal litter, throne or chariot.[131] From the life of king Tārāpīḍa these duties seem to have been assigned to the maidens only and, to a very great extent, we find the same arrangement being worked out at the court of Prabhākaravardhana.

SLAVERY

In Bāṇa's works and Harṣa's dramas and other contemporary literary works we are often told of the dāsyāḥputrāḥ or dāsyāḥ or antaḥpuradāsyāḥ and dāsīs which are invariably and indiscriminately translated as the slaves. But it is difficult to agree with the appropriateness of this rendering. As a matter of fact India never believed in an idea of inhuman ownership of man by man. We are told, by Megasthenes that all Indians were free and not one of them was slave;[132] and the renowned ambassador

---

128. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 111; *HCK.*, *Can. IV*, *P.* 7.
129. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 63; *HCK.*, *Can. II*, *P.* 35.
130. *Kauṭilya's Arthaśāstra*, *Pp.* 136-139.
131. *Ibid.*, *P.* 137.
132. *Mookerji*, *Chandragupta Maurya and His Times*, *P.* 195.

to the Mauryan court made this observation keeping in mind the picture of slavery that existed in ancient Greece or Rome. Even the Western scholars have come to agree that "Indian slavery was milder" and that slaves were "much less numerous than in the civilizations of the Occident."[133] India was never economically dependent on slavery and all people, especially of the working classes, were free citizens. The dāsas or dāsīs do not seem to have been a "regular article of commerce."[134] The slaves, if we accept the term for dāsas and dāsīs during the age of Harṣa, were well-treated as domestic servants. They were entrusted with all important affairs of the daily family life and enjoyed the affection and confidence of their masters. We are told in the Kādambarī that many "personal dāsyāḥ were sent with Chandrapīḍa by his mother while the latter had gone for a hunt."[135] It is really a matter of satisfaction that the protection and care of the only son were entrusted to these "personal dāsyāḥ."

So far as Yuan Chuang is concerned he does not make any direct reference to slavery. He indirectly points out that "individuals are not subject to forced labour contribution" and that even in the government services they were "paid according to their work."[136] From these remarks one can presume that the forced labour and slavery in its barbarous form was not practised in India during the age of Harṣa.

GENERAL CHARACTER OF THE PEOPLE

Generally speaking, the character of the people is determined by time and place. We always find variations in the habits, manners, attitudes, behaviour and temperament in the life of the individual in all parts of the country. Both Yuan Chuang and Bāṇa had travelled widely and they provide us with an elaborate account of the general character of the people.

We are told that the people were kind and gentle in behaviour

---

133. *Dr. A.L. Basham, The Wonder that was India, P.* 151.
134. *Ibid., P.* 153.
135. *Kādambarī, tr. Ridding, P.* 74.
136. *Watters, I, P.* 176.

and refined in their habits and manners. But this was not the case throughout the whole of Northern India. The people of some parts were deceitful, mean-minded, ill-natured, ill-mannered and rude in their behaviour. To sum up the description of the pilgrim the people of Nagar, Takṣaśilā, Matipur, Ahichchatra, Kānyakubja, Prayāg, Kauśāmbī, Vārāṇasī, Vaiśālī, Magadha, Puṇḍravardhana, Kāmarūpa etc. "were of good character, courageous, hospitable, fond of art and literature." They are said to have "esteemed learning" and possessed almost all good qualities of men. From this description we can safely conclude that the people of Āryāvarta or Madhyadeśa were noted for their good and noble qualities. But the pilgrim was unhappy to meet the people of Lampā, Gandhāra, Siṁhapura, Jālandhara, Nepāl and several other places. They were, as the pilgrim remarks, mean-minded, ill-mannered, deceitful etc.

In his usual survey the pilgrim sums up the character of the people of India in general. He says, "They are of hasty and irresolute temperaments, but of pure moral principles. They will not take anything wrongfully, and they yield more than fairness requires. They fear the retribution for sins in other lives, and make light of what conduct produces in this life. They do not practise deceit and they keep their sworn obligations."[137] Thus the general survey of the pilgrim reveals that the picture was satisfactory. He was also happy to observe that the government was honestly administered and the people lived together on good terms. The number of criminals was small.[138] The government seems to have been strict in dealing with social offences. The pilgrim observes, "For offences against social morality, disloyal and unfilial conduct, the punishment is to cut off the nose, or an ear, or a hand, or a foot, or to banish the offender to another country or into the wildness." This is very important in a society where great emphasis was laid on good conduct and noble principles. We find severe punishment for violation of moral code whereas the people did not suffer any corporal punishment even for the plots made against the sovereign.[139]

137. *Watters, I, P.* 171.
138. *Ibid., I, P.* 171.
139. *Ibid., I, P.* 171-72.

From this description of the pilgrim it is very clear that the general moral character and good social conduct were attached greater importance than anything else.

Bāṇa also gives due credit to sober manners and cultured way of behaviour. He designated his cousins as "the men of good manners and culture."[140] In all of his works and other literary creations we find the proper observance and cultivation of refined manners and etiquette.

ACTS OF SALUTATION AND REVERENCE

Yuan Chuang witnessed all acts of salutation and reverence with his own eyes. Moreover, he lived among cultured circles of princes, kings, priests, monks, philosophers and teachers and what he says about the etiquette and manners is worthy of our attention. He is also supported by other literary sources.

The pilgrim writes,[141] "There are nine degrees in the etiquette of showing respect." Firstly, "*Greeting with a kind inquiry*" was the first way of expression when people exchanged greetings. Secondly, people used to bow the head reverently. This was the most common way of salutation. Thirdly, the reverence was paid with "raising the hands to the head with an inclination of the body." This act of salutation was needed before the persons of higher ranks in the society. Fourthly, some people showed their respect bending their knees. Fifthly, kneeling long with both knees. Sixthly, kneeling on the knees with folded hands. Seventhly, some people saluted going down on the ground on hands and knees. Eightly, bowing down with knees, elbows and forehead to the ground. And finally, prostrating oneself on the earth was an act of showing honour.

These ways of showing reverence and honour from the fourth to ninth, as given above, seem to have been common in royal palaces. We have some instances of such salutation. Kumāragupta and Mādhavagupta bowed before Prabhākaravardhana "from afar till their four limbs and

---

140. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 73. प्रसन्नवृत्तयो गृहीतवाक्याः। *HCK.*, *Can.* 3, *P.* 39.
141. *Watters*, *I*, *P.* 173.

head touched the ground."[142] Skandagupta, the commandant of the elephants, saluted Harṣa from a distance leaning his hands upon the earth and touching it with his head.[143] When Haṁsavega, a confidential (*antaraṅgaḥ*), envoy (*dūtaḥ*), arrived, the chamberlain went forth in person to express his courtesy and respect,[144] while the envoy saluted the emperor by embracing the courtyard with his five limbs in homage.[145] Nirghāta laid his head on the ground and made his obeisance.[146]

Yuan Chuang informs us that "the performance of all these nine, from the lowest to the highest, is only one act of reverence."[147]

According to the pilgrim, the perfection of reverence was "to kneel and praise the excellences" of the person whom one saluted.[148] In the dramas of Harṣa we find one more act of salutation in which it was associated with utterances of words.[149] For example, in the Nāgānandaṁ Jīmūtavāhana saluted the hermit with the words, "I, Jīmūtavāhana, salute you, sir,"[150] and the person is blessed with words such as "May you live long" (*Āyuṣmān bhava*). Kings are saluted with words "Prosper, your excellency or devaḥ or Rājan etc. (*Jayatu Jayatu Bhavān*). Queens are often depicted as saluting their husbands with the expression like Ārya or Āryaputra or Bharttā.

Salutation was regarded as a necessary act of etiquette in the society. In the Nāgānandaṁ Malayavatī expresses such feelings to her

---

142. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 121. प्रविश्च च तौ दूरादेव चतुर्भिरंगैहस्तमांगेन च गां स्पृशन्तौ नमश्चक्रतु: । *HCK.*, *Can.* 4, *P.* 12.

143. *Ibid.*, *P.* 191; *HCK.*, *Can.* 6, *P.* 50.

144. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 211.

145. *Ibid.*, *P.* 211. आरादेव पंचांगालिंगितांगनः प्रणाममकरोत् । *HCK.*, *Can.* 7, *P.* 60.

146. *Ibid.*, *P.* 232.

147. *Watters, I, P.* 173.

148. *Ibid., I, P.* 173.

149. *Nāga., Act. II, P.* 56*ff.*; *Ratnā., Act.* 3, *Pp.* 318*ff.*

150. *Bhagavāna, Jīmūtavāhana ahamabhivādaya.*

friend that her torment was all the more severe for the reason that the gentleman whom she did not greet even with a word, might have considered her uncouth and mannerless. In the Harṣacharita also we find that Bāṇa did not pay tribute to Harṣa except by uttering Svastivāchana. Harṣa was annoyed over this breach of courtly etiquette and says that he would not see him (Bāṇa) as the latter had not offered him tribute of respect,[151] and characterises him as a great serpent (*Bhujaṅga*) for his unmannerly conduct. Men used to address each other with such words as Bhadra or Deva. A lady was addressed by a man as Devī whereas a lady addressed a man as Ārya. Proper etiquette was also observed in offering and accepting the seats. Bāṇa informs that Grahavaraman alone was offered by Prabhākaravardhana a seat equal to his own.[152] But sages and saints were given the highest honour so far the seating arrangement was concerned.[153] Bāṇa puts the following words in the mouth of Harṣa who says to Divākaramitra, when the latter asked the former to share his own seat, "The very ground in your presence is too high a station," and we know from Bāṇa's pen that the emperor sat on the ground.[154] In the Kādambarī we are informed that Chandrapīḍa could not accept the seat offered by Śukanāsa as the latter was regarded as a second father. He sat on the ground.[155] Even at the hunting camp all princes who accompanied Chandrapīḍa for hunting, sat in their order of seniority to take their morning meal.[156]

---

151. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 66; *HCK.*, *Can.* 2, *P.* 36.
152. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 128.
153. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 87-88.
154. *Ibid.*, *P.* 238.
155. *Kādambarī*, *tr. Ridding*, *P.* 71.
156. *Ibid.*, *P.* 74.

CHAPTER XI

RELIGION AND PHILOSOPHY

SECTION A

RELIGION

Religion is an integral and inseparable part of Indian culture. It has been an outstanding characteristic of India's glorious heritage. It is through religion that our great ancestors have made their major and everlasting contributions to the world, and profoundly influenced all the civilized world. It is through religion and philosophy rather than physical might or even art or literature that India's soul stamped its deep and the most notable imprint upon the civilizations of the world. This is one of the most significant achievements of this sacred land of India of which her sons are genuinely and legitimately proud.

One of the most important and significant features of the post-Maurya period was the complete revival of Brāhmaṇism, or what we call today Hinduism, marked its beginning in the Śuṅga period, but its predominance was firmly established on solid foundations during the age of Imperial Guptas. These foundations were further strengthened in the sixth and seventh centuries of the Christian Era and this gradual ascendancy brought about the decline of Buddhism. Although Yuan Chuang speaks with full magniloquence of its doctrinal developments and strict observance of a rigid code of conduct among the brethren, one fact becomes quite clear from his own records, as we shall see later, that Buddhism was declining in India. But Jainism did not undergo any major change; it neither marked any progress nor decay.

HINDUISM

During the course of our treatment of the social conditions we have referred to the main characteristics of the Hinduism. Varṇāśrama-

dharma, which is a significant synonym for Hinduism, gained complete ascendancy during the period under review. All the Vedic ceremonies and rituals came to be regarded as inseparable and integral constituents of Hinduism and the people practised them with sincere devotion and earnestness. In this chapter Hinduism will be discussed with a purely sectarian and religious viewpoint.

HINDU SCRIPTURES

The Vedas were the main sacred books of the Hindus and they were studied with remarkable reverence and earnestness. From the works of Bāṇa and other literary sources we know that they continued to be regarded as an essential and integral part of the Hindu Scriptures. The Brāhmaṇas of that period are especially depicted to have been well-versed in the Vedas.

Like the Vedas, the Purāṇas, the Śrutis and Smṛitis, the Rāmāyaṇa, and the Mahābhārata were also read with respectful attention and care. Hindus lived their lives according to the p inciples laid down in these works and it was meritorious to observe a strict and austere moral code as promulgated in these sacred texts. It is in these works that we find a true representation of a Hindu view of life.

THE SUPREME DEITIES

Brahmā, Viṣṇu and Maheśa formed the trinity of main gods of the Hindus. Brahmā is invariably represented in almost all the literary works of the period under review as the creator of the Universe; but he could not enjoy the acknowledged predominance that was attached to Lord Śiva and Viṣṇu. Their permanent omnipotence and omnipresence are quite clear from the fact that they were the supreme gods of the two main sects of that age, viz. Śaivism and Vaiṣṇavism which owed their name to Śiva and Viṣṇu respectively.

WORSHIP OF ŚIVA

Between Śiva and Viṣṇu, the former seems to have enjoyed the first place. Śaivism was the main theistic system of this period. Bāṇa

informs us that the people of Sthāṇvīśvara worshipped Śiva (*Khaṇḍaparśuḥ*).[1] To me it seems that the very name of the town of Sthāṇīśvara owed its name to a Liṅg of Śiva (*Paśupatiṁ*) of the same name.[2] Bāṇa speaks of Prabhākaravardhana's inborn devotion to Śiva. The latter is depicted as an upholder of the Universe, creator of the creatures and annihilator of existence. His (*Prabhākaravardhana's*) devotion to Śiva was so great that he did not believe in the existence of any other god except Śiva all over the three Lokas.[3] His devotion to Śiva is further confirmed by his attentions to Bhairavāchārya, a great Śaivite (*Mahāśaivaṁ*) of Southern India;[4] and because of his superlative devotion to the Holy Lord Śiva he was granted a boon to be "a founder of a mighty line of kings."[5]

Bāṇa informs us that "from childhood onwards it was the firm resolution of Bhāskaravarman never to do homage to any one except the lotus feet of Śiva."[6] Bāṇa begins to write his Harṣacharita with adoration to Śambhu and Umā. Likewise, Kādambarī was started with the expression of his reverence to Tryambaka wherein the Lord Śiva is said to be cause of creation, preservation and destruction. We find therein that Viṣṇu got the second place.[7] Before Bāṇa started for the journey he first went to worship Śiva. The references to Śiva worship are so many that it is not necessary to refer to them all. Lord Śiva is known to have been worshipped in many forms. He bore many names such as Mahākāla,[8] Trymbaka, Kāleśvara, Bhadreśvara, Āmrātakeśvara, Maheśvara, Kāpālikeśvara etc..

---

1. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 85; *HCK.*, *Can.* 3, *P.* 45.

2. *Sthāṇvīśvara is also a name of Liṅga of Śiva. Monierwilliams's Dictionary*, *P.* 1212.

3. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 84.

4. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 85; *HCK.*, *Can.* 3, *P.* 45.

5. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 97; *HCK.*, *Can.* 3, *Pp.* 53-54.

6. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 217; *HCK.*, *Can.* 7, *P.* 63.

7. *Kādambarī, tr. Ridding*, *P.* 1.

8. *The Mahākāla temple of Ujjayinī was noted for its grandeur in those days. Kādambarī, Ed. Parab*, *P.* 84.

Yuan Chuang also gives many instances of the Śiva-worship. He informs us that near one mountain in Gandhāra, there was a temple of Maheśvara-Deva.[9] He also mentions some Pāśupata Tīrthaka at various places.[10]

WORSHIP OF VIṢṆU

Vaiṣṇavism was very much popular during the age of the Imperial Guptas. Almost all Gupta emperors were the devout worshippers of Viṣṇu and they are characteristically designated as the Parama-Bhāgavatas. The imperial patronage extended to the Vaiṣṇava cult strengthened its foundations; it won the nation-wide popularity. But as soon as the Gupta glory was over the Vaiṣṇavism, too, was considerably weakened and lost its popularity. During the first half of the seventh century A.D. we mark the gradual decline of this sect and it is quite clear from rare references to Vaiṣṇavism. At the hermitage of Divākaramitra some Bhāgavatas are said to have been present along with the followers of various other sects.[11] Although Bhāskaravarman is represented as the worshipper of Śiva, his family is said to have belonged to the Vaiṣṇava line (*Vaiṣṇvo Vaṁśaḥ*).[12]

WORSHIP OF THE SUN

Besides Viṣṇu and Śiva, the Sun was the most important deity during the period under review. From the epigraphic records it becomes quite clear that almost all the ancestors of Harṣa were "the most devout worshippers of the Sun."[13] In the Harṣacharita and Kādambarī we find that after bath it was customary to offer worship to the Sun. According to Bāṇa, the people of Ujjayinī were devoted to the Sun.[14]

---

9. *Watters, I. P.* 221.
10. *Ibid., I, Pp.* 296*f.*
11. *HCCTH., P.* 236.
12. *Ibid., P.* 219.; *HCK., Can.* 7, *P.* 64.
13. *CII., Vol. III, P.* 232; *Ep. Ind., Vol. I, Pp.* 69-70; *Ibid., I, Pp.* 67-75.
14. *Kādambarī, Ed. Parab, P.* 88.

Besides these chief deities there were many other gods and goddesses who were worshipped by the people of that period. Indra, Varuṇa, Kubera, Agni, etc. were worshipped occasionally. Sarasvatī, Śrī or Lakṣmī, Umā or Gaurī, Chaṇḍī or Durgā were the chief godesses to whom due reverence was paid by the people of that period.

SECTION B

OTHER MINOR SECTS AND PHILOSOPHICAL SYSTEMS

Bāṇa gives us an excellent description of the various sects and philosophical systems which flourished in the seventh century A.D.. At the hermitage of the great sage Divākaramitra there were the followers of these different religious sects and systems.[15] Besides the Bhāgavatas, the following must be mentioned here.

(1) There were the Śvetāmbaras. Bāṇa calls them 'Śvetapaṭāḥ.'

(2) There were Keśaluñchanāḥ i.e. the people who pulled out their hair. They probably belonged to the Digambara school.

(3) The followers of Kapila who are called the Kapilāḥ. But their school in the philosophical sense is famous as the Sāṅkhya System.[16]

(4) The Lokāyatikas were the followers of Chārvaka, the first system of atheistic materialism. According to this school of philosophy, there is no creator of the Universe; there is no soul, and there is no rebirth.

(5) There were Kaṇādaḥ or the Vaiśeṣikas. The school was founded by Kaṇāda.

(6) The Aupaniṣadās ; some of them are called the Aupaniṣadās. They were the followers of the doctrine of the Upaniṣadas.

(7) The Aiśvarakāraṇikās : They believed in one Supreme Being (*Īśvara*) as the cause or creator of the Universe. According to Dr. P. V. Kāṇe, they probably belonged to 'Māheśvaramata' according

---

15. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 236; *HCK.*, *Can.* 8, *P.* 73. *For the English terms I have consulted the Dictionary of Monier-Williams and Notes on HC. by Mr. P. V. Kāṇe.*

16. *Sāṅkhya School is also mentioned in the Kādambarī. Kādambarī, tr. Ridding, P.* 212.

to which Īśvara is the only cause (*nimittakāraṇa*) of the world or to the Nyāya system founded by Gautama.

(8) Dhātuvādins or Kārandhamins : They probably belonged to the school of Alchemists. Their school was also known as Raseśvara-darśana, which believed that mercury, if properly treated, would make men immortal.

(9) Dharmaśāstrins : They were the persons who studied the various smṛitis.

(10) Paurāṇikas : They were the persons who mastered the Purāṇas. The latter must have been their sacred texts.

(11) Sāptatantavas : They studied the sacrifices. According to Dr. Kāṇe, they were the students of Pūrvamīmāṁsā system founded by Jaimini in which the most prominent place is assigned to sacrifice.

(12) Vaiyākaraṇas stood for those who believed that the thorough study of the grammar would lead to the Mokṣa.

(13) Pañcharātras were the followers of the Pañcharātra doctrine. In the Mahābhārata we are told that Nārada promulgated the Pañcharātra doctrine after receiving it from Nārāyaṇa.[17]

After Prabhākaravardhana's death Harṣa is said to have been accompanied by the Brahmavādins. These Brahmavādins seem to be the Vedāntins in the Upaniṣadic sense. They are said to have been well-versed in the knowledge of the transitoriness of this world. These Brahma-vādins were the Vedāntins of the Advaita school, "for the dualists could have nothing to say by the way of conclusion on the death of person."[18] The adjective "saṁṣārāsāratvakathanakuśalāḥ" leaves no doubt as to the exact nature of the 'Brahmavādins', and the words "Saṁsārāsāratva" "is not a mere unsubstantiated postulate;" but it is well-meditated doctrine and "well-thought-out theory" of the Brahmavādins of the seventh century A.D..

---

17. *Shānti Parva*. 340-112. *quoted by Mr. Kane : HCK., Can.* 7, *P.* 73, *Notes, P.* 223.

18. *Ind. Ant.*, 1933, *Prof. Dasaratha Sharma's Article* : "*The Advaita Vedānta in the Seventh Century A.D.*" *P.* 78.

BUDDHISM

Yuan Chuang gives us sufficient information about Buddhism. From his records one fact becomes quite clear that Buddhism was declining day by day. Besides its main divisions into Mahāyāna and Hīnayāna, Buddhism was subdivided into as many as eighteen different schools. In addition to these divisions and subdivisions, Buddhism marked its "transformation from the prinstine simplicity of an austere moral code to the most complex system."[19]

The great credulity, pompous adoration of the relics and fantastic miracles crept into Buddhism. During this period an immense literature was piled up by the Buddhist monks. They began to pretend to possess superhuman powers. During this period greater importance was attached to the erection and consecration of huge monasteries and saṁghārāmas which were elaborately decorated. The Chaityas, the Dhātugarbhas, triumphal pillars, the stūpas and the convents abounded in the country.

Yuan Chuang, who visited India as a religious missionary, throws much light on the religious conditions of India during the period under review. He not only refers to state of Buddhism, but also to other cults as well. His description, therefore, deserves brief reference in order to understand the religious conditions of India during the age of Harṣavardhana.

KAPIŚA (KA-PI-SHIH)

We are told that the king of Kapiśa was "a benevolent ruler and an adherent of Buddhism. He made every year a silver image of Buddha 18 feet hight, and at the Moksha-parishad he gave liberally to the needy and to widows. There were above 100 Monasteries with more than 500 Brethren who were chiefly Mahāyānists; the topes and monasteries were lofty and spacious and were kept in good order. Of the Deva-Temples there were some tens; and above 1000 professed Sectarians, Digaṁbaras, and Paṁsupatas (*Pāśupatas*), and those who wear wreaths of skulls as head-ornaments."[20]

---

19. *CA.*, *P.* 367.
20. *Watters*, *I*, *Pp.* 123-3.

LAMPA (LAN-P'O)

We are told that "there were above ten Buddhist monasteries and a few brethren the most of whom were Mahāyānists. The Non-Buddhists had a score or two of temples and they were very numerous."[21] This description of the pilgrim shows that Hinduism was stronger and more popular than Buddhism in the north-west border area.

NAGAR (NA-KIE (KA)-LO-HO)

Here the people were "reverencing Buddha and having little faith in other religious systems. But although there were many Buddhist establishments the brethren were very few. There were five Deva-Temples and above 100 professed non-Buddhists."[22] Like Lampa, here too, the Buddhism appears to have declined.

GĀNDHĀRA (KAN-T'O-LO)

Here, too, Buddhism was on rapid decline. The pilgrim records, "the majority adhered to other systems of religion, a few being Buddhists."[23] This was probably the result of constant triumph of Hinduism since the times of Puṣyamitra Śuṅga who championed the cause of Brāhmaṇaism after the fall of the Mauryas.[24] After the Śuṅgas the revivalist movement continued and Prabhākaravardhana, who was a great militant śaivite, must have added further support to that revival after his conquest of Gāndhāra. Pilgrim's further remark confirms our conclusion. He says,

21. *Watters, I, P.* 181.

22. *Ibid., I, P.* 181.

23. *Ibid., I, P.* 199.

24. *This is why Puṣyamitra Śuṅga is described as "cruel persecutor of Buddhism," in Buddhist traditions. Divyāvadāna records that "he destroyed monasteries and killed monks." He is said to have announced a reward of a hundred gold coins for a head of a monk. Divyāvadāna, Pp.* 429-34; *also IHQ., Vol. XXII, Pp.* 81*ff; HCIP., Vol. II, P.* 97. *The traditions as recorded in the Divyāvadāna appear to be exaggerated but Puṣyamitra must have championed the cause of Varṇāśramadharma.*

"There were above 1000 Buddhist monasteries in the country but they were utterly dilapidated and untenanted. Many of the topes were in ruin. There were above 100 Deva-Temples and the various sects lived pell-mell."[25]

THE CITY OF PUṢKARĀVATĪ (PU-SE-KA-LO-FA-TI)

Yuan Chuang tells us, "Outside the west gate of the city was a Deva-Temple with a marvel-working image of the Deva."[26] But there was no Buddhist monastery here. He tells us that about "four or five li north of the city was an old monastery", but it was "in ruins and with only a few brethren who were all Hinayānists."[27]

THE CITY OF PALUŚA (PO-LU-SHA)

Here was a "monastery with above fifty brethren all adherents of the "Small Vehicle" (the Hinayānists).[28]

Near this city there were two more monasteries, one "out side the east gate of the city with above fifty brethren" and another "on the south" which had "a few brethren." They were Mahāyānists.[29]

In the vicinity of this town, above fifty li to the north-east, there "was a temple of Maheśvaradeva in which the ash-smearing 'Tirthikas' performed much worship."[30]

UDYĀNA (MU-CHANG-NA)[31]

The people of Udyāna were held "in high esteem" and "were reverential believers in Mahāyāna." But here, too, Buddhism was

---

25. *Watters, I, P.* 202.
26. *Ibid., I, P.* 214.
27. *Ibid., I, P.* 214.
28. *Ibid., I, P.* 217.
29. *Ibid., I, P.* 218.
30. *Ibid., I.* 221.
31. *According to Cunningham it corresponds to present districts of Pangkora, Bijāwar, swāt, and Runir. Anc. Geog. of Ind., P.* 81; *JARS.*, 1896, *P.* 655.

declining rapidly. The pilgrim tells us that "there had formerly been 1400 monasteries but many of these were then in ruins and once there had been 18000 Brethren but these had gradually decreased until only a few remained; these were all Mahāyānists ... Of Deva-Temples there were above ten and the various sectarians lived pell-mell."[32]

BOLOR (PO-LU-LO)

In this country "there were some hundreds of Buddhist Monasteries; and some thousands of Brethren who were without definite learning, and were very defective in their observance of the rules of their Order."[33] The pilgrim does not record the number of Deva-Temples and the followers of other sects.

TAKṢAŚILĀ (TA-CHA-SHI-LO)

The people of Takṣaśilā are said to be the "adherents of Buddhism." But the Order was declining rapidly. The pilgrim observes, "Although the monasteries were numerous, many of them were desolate and the brethren who were very few, were all Mahāyānists."[34] Buddhism must have spread in Takṣaśilā after Aśoka extended patronage to it. But it must have declined in the times of Puṣyamitra Śuṅga.

SIṄHAPURA (SENG-HA-PU-LO)

The pilgrim does not refer to the total number of the monasteries, but it is certain from his description that the Buddhism was rapidly declining. He tells of several monasteries of which many are said to be deserted and a few were with some brethren. The country appears to have been inhabited by Jains and Hindus.[35]

URASA (WU-LA-SHIP)

The people "were not Buddhists and it appears that Buddhism

32. *Watters, I, P.* 226.
33. *Ibid., I, P.* 240.
34. *Ibid., I, P.* 240.
35. *Ibid., I, Pp.* 248*ff.*

was almost wiped off from this country." The pilgrim tells us of only one monastery which contained a few brethren all Mahāyānists."[36]

KASHMĪR (KIA-SHI-MI-LO)

The people of Kashmīr "had a faith which embraced orthodoxy and heterodoxy (that is, Buddhism and other religions)." The pilgrim tells us that "the Buddhist monasteries were above 100 in number, and there were above 5000 buddhist Brethren."[37] Watters has, however, drawn our attention to the accounts of Wu-k'ung who visited Kashmīr after about a century. He gives the number of monasteries as 300.[38] We cannot explain this marked difference in the number of Buddhist establishments.[39]

PUNACH OR PUNATS (PAN-NU-TS'O)

The pilgrim records that the people of this country "were sincere believers in Buddhism." Referring to the Buddhist establishments he tells us that "the Buddhist monasteries of which there were five, were in ruinous condition," and "in a monastery to the north of the capital were a few brethren."[40]

RĀJAPURA (HO-LO-SHE-PU-LO)

In this country "there were ten Buddhist monasteries and "the Brethren were few in number; there was one Deva-Temple but the non-Buddhist were very numerous."[41]

On the basis of this description it appears almost certain that in Kashmīr and its dependencies Buddhism was declining rapidly. Many

36. *Ibid.*, *P.* 256.

37. *Ibid.*, *P.* 261.

38. *Journal Asiatique*, 1895, *Pp.* 341*ff*; *Watters*, *I*, *P.* 264.

39. *He records a little later that Aśoka had built* 500 *monasteries. They might have been deserted in Yuan Chuang's time and Wu-K'ung might have found only three hundred of them.*

40. *Watters*, *I*, *P.* 283.

41. *Ibid.*, *I*, *P.* 284.

of the monasteries were either in ruined condition or were deserted and only a few of them had a small number of Brethren.

TAKKA (CHEH-KA)

From Rājapura the pilgrim reached the Takka country. Like Kashmīr here, too, Buddhism was declining rapidly. We are told that only "few" of the inhabitants believed in Buddhism, and the most of the people served the Devas; there were ten Buddhist monasteries and some hundreds of Deva-Temples."[42]

CHINĀBHUKTI OR CHINĀPATI (CHI-NA-P'UH-TI)

People of this country appear to have followed all faiths equally. The pilgrim tells us that "the people embraced Buddhism and secular knowledge, and orthodoxy and heterodoxy had each its adherents. There were ten Buddhist monasteries and nine Deva-Temples."[43]

TAMASAVANA MONASTERY

About 500 li[44] to the south-east of the capital of Chinābhukti was the Tamasavana monastery. This monastery "had above 300 Brethren of the Sarvāstivādin School"[45] who are said to be "thorough students of the Hīnayāna."

JĀLANDHARA (SHE-LAN-TA-LO)

In this country "there were above fifty monasteries with more than 2000 Brethren who made special studies in the Great and Little Vehicles."[45] Referring to the Deva-Temples he tells us that they "were three with more than 500 professed non-Buddhist of the Pāśupata sect."[46] This description does not appear correct as we know that after the fall of Mauryas there

---

42. *Watters., I, P.* 286.
43. *Ibid., I, P.* 291.
44. *In Life this distance is only* 50 *li.* *Watters, I, P.* 294.
45. *Ibid., I, P.* 294.
46. *Ibid., I, P.* 296.

was enough persecution of Buddhism and we cannot accept this high number of Buddhist monasteries in Jālandhara.

KULLU OR KULUTA (KU-LU-TO)

This country had "twenty Buddhist Monasteries with above 1000 Brethren of whom the most were Mahāyānists" and a few adhering to other schools (that is, belonging to the Hīnayāna system)." Talking about the Deva-Temples he tells us that they "were fifteen and the professed non-Buddhists lived pell-mell."[47]

ŚATADRU (SHE-TO-T'-ULU)

The people of this country are said to have been devoted to Buddhism. The pilgrim tells us that "in and about the capital were ten monasteries, but they were desolate, and the Brethren were very few."[48] He, however, does not refer to the Deva-Temples, but it appears almost certain that the Hinduism must have been strengthened as Buddhism was declining.

PĀRYĀTRA (P'O-LI-YE-TA-LO)

The pilgrim records that there were only eight Buddhist Monasteries but all of them were "in a bad state of ruin" and "the Brethren were very few in number." The Hinduism, on the other hand, was quite popular. We are told that there were ten Deva-Temples and the professed non-Buddhists were above 1000 in number."[49]

MATHURĀ (MO (OR MEI)T'U-LO)[50]

The People of Mathurā are said to have "believed in the working

---

47. *Watters., I, P.* 296.

48. *Ibid., I, P.* 299.

49. *Ibid., I, P.* 300.

50. *There are several Chinese traditions regarding Mathurā. According to Growse this name is said to have been derived from the Sanskrit root 'Math', to churn, "the churn forming a prominent feature in all poetical descriptions of the local scenery." Mathura, Sec. ed., P.* 73.

of Karma, and paid respect to moral and intellectual eminence." Referring to the number of the monasteries and temples the pilgrim tells us that "there were in the district above twenty Buddhist monasteries, and above 2000 Brethren who were diligent students of both Vehicles. There are also five Deva-Temples and the professed adherants of different non-Buddhist sects lived pell-mell."[51] The pilgrim also refers to "the relics of the holy disciples of Śākya Ju-lai."[52] These disciples are Sāriputra, Mudgalaputra, Pūrṇamaitriyāniputra, Upāli, Ānanda, and Rāhula.

Yuan Chuang also throws some light on other practices and ceremonies of the Buddhists. According to him, "on the six Fast-days of every month, the Brethren, with mutual rivalry, make up parties, and taking materials of worship with many valuables, repair to the images of their special patrons. The Abhidharma Brethren offer worship to Sāriputra, the Samādhists to Mudgalaputra, the Sūtraists to Purṇamaitriyāniputra, the Vinayists to Upāli, the Bhikṣuṇīs to Ānanda, the Śrāmaneras to Rāhula; and the Mahāyānists to the various P'usas." Referring to the modes of worship and other paraphernalia the pilgrim records that on the days of fasting, the topes vie with each other in worship; banners and sunshades are displayed, the incense makes clouds and the flowers are scattered in showers, the sun and the moon are obscured and the mountain-ravines convulsed."[53]

STHĀNEŚVARA (SA-T'A-NI-SSU-FA-LO)

At the capital of this country there were "three Buddhist monasteries with above 700 professed Buddhists, all Hīnayānists." But as compared to these monasteries and the number of the Buddhists Brethren the Hinduism was very strong. We have glimpes of Hinduism in general and Śaivism in particular in the works of Bāṇa. The pilgrim records that "there were above 100 Deva-Temples and the non-Buddhists were very

51. *Watters, I, P.* 301.
52. *Ibid., I, P.* 302.
53. *Ibid., I, P.* 302.

numerous."[54] This supports our conclusion that the cause of Hinduism was championed by the Puṣpabhūtis in Sthāneśvara.

ŚRUGHNA (SU-LU-K' IN-NA)

The pilgrim tells us that "the inhabitants" of this country "were not Buddhists : they held useful learning in respect and esteemed religious wisdom." Like Sthāneśvara, Śrughna was also a great stronghold of Hinduism. This is clear from Uan Chuang's statement. Referring to the Buddhist and Hindu Establishments he tells us, "there were five Buddhist monasteries and above 1000 Buddhist ecclesiastics, the majority of whom were Hīnayānists, a few adhering to other schools. The Brethren were expert and lucid expounders of abstract doctrines, and distinguished Brethren from other lands came to them to reason out their doubts. There were 100 Deva-Temples, and the non-Buddhists were very numerous."[55]

MATIPURA (MO-TI-PU-LO)

This country is generally identified with Madāwar or Mandāwar, "a large town in western Rohilkhaṇḍa, near Bijnor."[56] The people of this country are said to have been "equally divided between Buddhism and other religions."[57] But this statement of the pilgrim does not sound well if we take into consideration what he tells us later. We are told that "there were above ten Buddhist monasteries with above 800 Brethren mostly adherents of the Sarvāstivādin school of the Hīnayāna." But the temples are said to be "above fifty" and, therefore, we cannot believe the pilgrim that the people "were equally divided between Buddhism and other religions." The king of this country was also a believer in Hinduism. Thus it is quite certain that Hinduism was strong in this country.

MAYŪRA (MO-YU-LO)

The pilgrim records that "near the city and close to the Ganges

---

54. *Ibid.*, *P.* 314.
55. *Watters*, *I*, *P.* 318.
56. *Anc. Geog. of Ind.*, *P.* 348.
57. *Watters*, *I*, *P.* 322.

was a large Deva-Temple of many miracles, and in its enclosure was a tank the banks of which were faced with stone slabs, the tank being fed by an artificial passage from the Ganges. This was called the Ganges-Gate and it was a place for making religious merit and extinguishing guilt; there were constantly many thousands of people from distant regions assembled here for bathing. Pious kings erected Puṇyaśālās in the district for the free distribution of dainty food and medical requisites to the kinless and friendless."[58] This Ganges-Gate "is identified with Gaṅgādvāra of the Indian writers, the modern Hardvāra (*Haridvāra*)."[59] According to Cunningham, the city of Mayūra must be the present ruined site of Māyāpura, at the head of the Ganges canal."[60]

BRAHMAPURA (P'O-LO-HIH-MO-PU-LO)

This was a stronghold of the Hindus, and, it appears that the pilgrim was not happy there. He tells us that "the people had rough ways" and "they cared little for learning and pursued gain."[61] Referring to the religious establishments he tells us that "there were five Buddhist monasteries, but there were very few Brethren; there were above ten Deva-Temples and the sectarians lived pell-mell."[62]

GOVIŚAṆA (KU-P'I-SANG-NA)

We are told that "the people had honest sincere ways; they applied themselves to learning and were fond of religious merit; most of them were non-Buddhists, and sought the joys of this life."[63] Referring to the religious establishments he tells us that "there were two Buddhist monasteries with above 100 Brethren all Hīnayānists. Of Deva-Temples there were above 30, and the sectarians lived pell-mell."[64]

---

58. *Ibid.*, *I*, *P*. 328.
59. *Ibid.*, *I*, *P*. 329.
60. *Anc. Geog. of Ind.*, *P*. 351.
61. *Watters.*, *I*, *P*. 329.
62. *Ibid.*, *I*, *P*. 329.
63. *Ibid.*, *I*, *P*. 329.
64. *Ibid.*, *I*, *P*. 330-31.

AHICHHATRĀ (NGO(OR O)-HI-CH'I-TA-LO)

The people here are said to be "honest in their ways; they studied abstract truth and were diligent in learning, with much ability and extensive knowledge." Referring to the religious establishments the pilgrim tells us that "there were above ten Buddhist monasteries, and more than 1000 Brethren students of the Sammatīya school of the Hīnayāna. Deva-Temples were nine in number and there were above 300 professed adherents of the other systems Pāśupatas who worshipped Īśvara (Śiva)."[65]

VILAŚĀṆA OR BHILASANA (P'I-LO-SHAN-NA)

This territory in the vicinity of Ahichhatrā[66] was a stronghold of the Hindus. The pilgrim records that "the people were mainly non-Buddhists, a few reverencing Buddhism."[67] Referring to the Buddhist establishments he tells us that "there were two Buddhist monasteries with 300 Brethren all Mahāyāna students. There were five Deva-Temples and the sectarians lived pell-mell."[68]

KAPITHA OR SĀṄKAŚYA (KAH-PI-T'A)

Like many important centres in the kingdom of Harṣa this was also a great centre of Hindus. The pilgrim tells us that "there were four Buddhist monasteries and above 1000 Brethren, all of the Sammatīya School." Referring to the Deva-Temples he tells us that the number of the temples was the and "the non-Buddhists, who lived pell-mell, were the Śaivites."[69] That this place was a very important religious centre through the ages, is proved by various works.[70]

---

65. *Ibid., I, P.* 331.
66. *Anc. Geog. of India, P.* 365.
67. *Watters, I, P.* 332.
68. *Ibid., I, P.* 332.
69. *Ibid., I, P.* 333.
70. *Ind. Ant., Vol. XXII., P.* 180; *Alberuni., I, P.* 300; *Divyāvadāna, P.* 150; *W. W. Rockhill, Life of the Buddha, P.* 81; *R. L. Mitra, The Sanskrit Buddhist Lit. of Nepāl, P.* 296.

KĀNYAKUBJA (KA-NO-KU-SHE) OR MODERN KANAUJ

The people of Kanauj are said to be 'clear and suggestive in discourse; they were equally divided between orthodoxy and heterodoxy."[71] This statement of the pilgrim pertaining to the equal division between the orthodoxy and heterodoxy does not appear well-founded as we know that Kanauj was a great centre of Hinduism. This is also confirmed by the pilgrim himself who gives figures of the religious establishments and their followers. He tells us that "there were above 100 Buddhist monasteries with more than 10000 Brethren who were students of both the Vehicles." Referring to the temples the pilgrim tells us, "there were more than 200 Deva-Temples and the non-Buddhists were several thousands in number."[72] We must admit that the number of the monasteries is admittedly large. When Fa-hien visited the place he found two monasteries there.[73] After the visit of Yuan Chuang, too, we find Buddhism in decline. During the visit of the Sung pilgrim the District had "topes and temples" with "no monks ,or nuns."[74]

The pilgrim also refers to other religious establishments in the suburbs of Kanauj. He tells us that "there were other sacred Buddhist buildings near the city, and there were also splendid temples to the Sun god and to Maheśvara respectively."[75]

NAVADEVAKULA (NA-FO-T'O-P'O-KU-LO)[76]

We are told that "to the north-west of this city and on the east bank of the Ganges, was magnificent Deva-Temple." There were three Buddhist monasteries with "above 500 Brethren all Sarvāstivādins." He,

71. *Watters, I, P.* 340.

72. *Ibid., I, P.* 340.

73. *Fa-hien's Record of Buddhist Kingdoms, tr. and annoted by James Legge, M. A., LL.D., Oxford,* 1886, *P.* 54.

74. *Cited by Watters, Vol. I, P.* 343.

75. *Ibid., I, P.* 352.

76. *This city "is supposed to be represented by the present Nohbatganj." Ibid., I, P.* 352*; Anc. Geog. of Ind., P.* 382.

however, does not refer to the adherents of Hindu sects who lived in the temple. This is natural in the description of one whose mission was "primarily Buddhistic." Watters appears to be correct when he comments that "it is not unlikely that it (the city) was from the splendid Deva-Temple which Yuan Chuang here describes very briefly that the city obtained its name."[77] The temple "may have been devoted to the worship of Viṣṇu."[78]

AYODHYĀ (A-YU-T'E)

The pilgrim appears to have been very much impressed by the people of Ayodhyā who are said to be "fond of good works." and who were "devoted to practical learning." Referring to the religious establishments the pilgrim tells us that "there were above 100 Buddhist monasteries, and more than 3000 Brethren who were students of both Vehicles." Of the temples he tells us that "they were ten in number and the non-Buddhists were few in number."[79] As usual the pilgrim again exaggerates his accounts of Buddhist strength. We know that Ayodhyā has remained through the age as one of the most important seats of Hindu religion and culture.

HAYAMUKHA OR ĀYAMUKHA (A-YE-MU-K'A)

The people of this principality also impressed the pilgrim who tells us that "the character of the people was good; they were studious and given to good works." Referring to the religious establishments the pilgrim tells us that "there were five Buddhist monasteries with above 1000 Brethren who were adherents of the Sammatīya School, and there were more than ten Deva-Temples."[80] The pilgrim does not refer to the strength of non-Buddhists but as their temples are more than double as compared with the Buddhist monasteries, the number of non-Buddhists must have been pretty large.

---

77. *Watters, I, P.* 352.
78. *Ibid., I, P.* 353.
79. *Ibid., I, P.* 355.
80. *Ibid., I, P.* 359.

PRAYĀGA (PO-LO-YA-KA)

The pilgrim was very much impressed by the people of Prayāga. The place was one of the most important strongholds of Hinduism, and Buddhism could never find many followers here. The pilgrim tells us that "there were only two Buddhist establishments and very few Brethren all Hīnayānists." But the number of the Deva-Temples was very large. We are told that "there were some hundreds of Deva-Temples and the majority of the inhabitants were non-Buddhists."[81] The pilgrim also tells us of a Deva-Temple with "a great wide spreading umbrageous tree" where visitors "had continuously from old times all lightly committed suicide. But later this practice was abandoned with an effort of "a very wise and learned Brāhmaṇa."[82]

The pilgrim tells us that "at the junction of the rivers....every day numbers of people arrived to die in the sacred water, hoping to be thereby reborn in Heaven."[83]

KOŚĀMBĪ (KIAO-SHANG-MI)

The pilgrim praises the people of Kośāmbī as "enterprising, fond of arts, and cultivators of religious merit."[84] Referring to religious establishments he tells us that "there were more than ten Buddhist monasteries, but all in utter ruin; and the Brethren, who were above 300 in number, were adherents of the Hīnayāna system." This description makes it certain that the Buddhism was declining in this district and the Hinduism, on the other hand, was making rapid progress as we learn that "there were more than fifty Deva-Temples and the non-Buddhists were very numerous."[85]

VIŚOKA (PI (OR PING, OR P'I, OR FI)-SHO-KA)

The people of this country are said to have "had good ways, were

81. *Ibid.*, *I*, *P*. 361.
82. *Ibid.*, *I*, *P*. 362.
83. *Ibid.*, *I*, *P*. 364.
84. *Ibid.*, *I*, *P*. 366.
85. *Ibid.*, *I*, *P*. 366.

studious and given to good works."[86] Referring to the religious establishments the pilgrim tells us that there were "above twenty Buddhist monasteries and 3000 Brethren who were all adherents of the Sammatīya School. There were above 50 Deva-Temples and the non-Buddhists were very numerous."[87] This was also a stronghold of Hinduism.

ŚRĀVASTĪ (SHIH-LO-FA-SI-T'I)

The pilgrim tells us that "the people had honest ways and were given to learning and fond of good works."[88] Referring to the condition of Buddhism he tells us that "there were some hundreds of Buddhist monasteries of which the most were in ruin, the Brethren who were very few, were Sammatīyas." This shows that in Śrāvastī Buddhism had declined quite rapidly and Hinduism became quite popular. Referring to the religious establishments of the Hindus he tells us that "there were 100 Deva-Temples and the non-Buddhists were very numerous."[89]

KAPILAVASTU (KIE-PI-LO-FA-SU-TU)

Here, too, Buddhism had declined. The pilgrim refers to the "remains of above 1000 Buddhist monasteries." He tells us of only one "existing monastery with above 30 inmates, adherents of Sammatīya School." The pilgrim refers to "two Deva-Temples, and the sectarians lived pell-mell."[90]

RĀMA OR RĀMAGRĀMA (LAN-MO)

The place was deeply connected with Buddhism but when the pilgrim visited the site, it "had been waste and wild for a long time....its towers were heaps of ruins and there was a scanty population."[91]

---

86. *Ibid., I, P.* 373.
87. *Ibid., I, P.* 373.
88. *Ibid., I, P.* 377.
89. *Ibid., I, P.* 377.
90. *Ibid., II, P.* 1.
91. *Ibid., II,* 20; *Beal, II, P.* 26.

KUŚĪNAGARA (KOU-SHIH-NA-KA-LO)

This was once a flourishing centre of Buddhism but when the pilgrim visited it he found it deserted.

VĀRĀṆASI (PO-LO-NA-SE)

The pilgrim was very much impressed by the people of Vārāṇasī who "were gentle and courteous and esteemed devotion to learning; the majority of them believed in the other systems and only a few of them were Buddhists."[92] In fact the city has been one of the main strongholds of Hinduism in general and Śaivism in particular. The pilgrim's description also supports this view. Referring to the religious establishments and followers he tells us that "there were above thirty Buddhist monasteries with more than 3000 Brethren all adherents of the Sammatīya School. Of Deva-Temples there were above 100, and there were more than 10000 professed adherents of the sects, the majority being devotees of Śiva;.... Within the Capital were 20 Deva-Temples....and the temple-caves were of carved stone and ornamented wood; thickets of trees gave continuous shade and there were streams of pure water; there was a t'u-shi (bell-metal?) image of Deva (probably Śiva) nearly 100 feet high which was life-like in its awe-inspiring majesty."[93] After his description of the city the pilgrim refers to various Buddhist establishments at Sārnāth including the Deer-Park Monastery.

GHĀZĪPUR ? (CHAN-CHU)

The inhabitants of this country won the admiration of the pilgrim who tells us that they "were honest and high-spirited and they had a mixed religious creed."[94] Referring to the religious establishments and the followers of various sects he tells us that "there were above ten Buddhist establishments with nearly a thousand Brethren all attached to the system

---

92. *Watters, II, P.* 47.
93. *Ibid., II, P.* 47.
94. *Ibid., II, P.* 59.

of the 'Little Vehicle." There were twenty Deva-Temples and the followers of the different non-Buddhist systems dwelt pell-mell."[95]

VAIŚĀLĪ (FEI-SHE-LI)

The people of this country are praised by the pilgrim who tells us that they "were honest, fond of good works, esteemers of learning, and orthodox and heterodox in faith."[96] Referring to the religious establishments he tells us that "the Buddhist establishments, of which there were some hundreds, were with the exception of three or four, dilapidated and deserted, and the Brethren were very few." This shows that the Buddhism had declined in this region. On the other hand Hinduism made tremendous progress. This is clear from the description of the pilgrim who tells us that "there were some tens of Deva-Temples, the various sects lived pell-mell." He also tells us that "the Digambaras flourished" in this country.[97]

VṚIJI (FU-LI-CHIH)

In this district "there were few Buddhists, and the monasteries were above ten in number, the Brethren of which, less than 1000 in number, were students and adherents of both the 'Great and Little Vehicles." The number of Deva-Temples was much higher as compared to the Buddhist monasteries. The pilgrim records that "there were some tens of Deva-Temples and the non-Buddhists were very numerous."[98]

NEPĀL (NI-P'O-LO)

The pilgrim did not visit the kingdom of Nepāl and he has written about the valley on the basis of what he heard about Nepāl in India. He records that "the people were rude and deceitful, good faith and rectitude were slighted by them; they had no learning but were skilful mechanics; they were ugly and coarse in appearance, and they believed both in false

---

95. *Ibid.*, *II*, *P.* 59.
96. *Ibid.*, *II*, *P.* 63.
97. *Ibid.*, *II*, *P.* 63.
98. *Ibid.*, *II*, *P.* 81.

and true religion, the Buddhist monasteries and the Deva-Temples touching each other."[99] Referring to the number of Buddhists he tells us that "there were above 2000 Buddhists ecclesiastics who were attached to both 'Vehicles' and the number of the Non-Buddhists was not ascertained."[100]

MAGADHA (MO-KIE-TO)

The pilgrim appears to have been impressed with the people of Magadha who "were honest in character;.....esteemed learning and reverenced Buddhism."[101] Referring to the religious establishments he tells us that "there were above fifty Buddhist monasteries, and more than 10000 ecclesiastics, for the most part adherents of Mahāyāna system. There were some tens of Deva-Temples, and the adherents of the various sects were very numerous."[102]

Śaśāṅka is said to have caused hardships to Buddhists. He is said to have championed the cause of Śaivism. The pilgrim records that "by Śaśāṅka's extermination of Buddhism the groups of Brethren were all broken up."[103] He is said to have "tried in vain to efface the foot-prints; caused the Stone to be thrown into the Ganges, but it returned to its original place."[104] Later the pilgrim records, "in recent times, Śaśāṅka, the enemy and oppressor of Buddhism, cut down the Bodhi tree, destroyed its roots down to the water and burned what remained."[105] Yuan Chuang also refers to his (Śaśāṅka's) "abortive attempt to have the image (*of Buddha*) removed and replaced by one of Śiva."[106]

MONGHYR (I-LAN-NA-PO-FA-TO)

The people of this country are said to be "of honest ways." The

99. *Ibid., II, P.* 83.
100. *Ibid., II, P.* 84.
101. *Ibid., II, P.* 86.
102. *Ibid., II, P.* 87.
103. *Ibid., II, P.* 43.
104. *Ibid., II, P.* 92.
105. *Ibid., II, P.* 115.
106. *Ibid., II, P.* 116.

pilgrim tells us that "there were above ten Buddhist monasteries and more than 4000 Brethren the most of whom were Hīnayānists of the Sammatiya School."[107] The progress of Hinduism was better as compared to that of Buddhism. The pilgrim informs that "there were above twenty Deva-Temples and the adherents of various religions lived pell-mell."

CHAMPĀ (CHAN-P'0)

Here Buddhism had declined rapidly. The pilgrim tells us that "there were some tens of monasteries mostly in ruins, and there were above 200 Brethren all Hīnayānists."[108] The pilgrim forgot to refer to the number of the Deva-Temples. He makes only a casual reference to one Deva-Temple. This omission is just an error and we have every reason to believe that Hinduism and other sects, other than Buddhism, must have flourished in this region.

KAJAṄGALA (KA-CHU-WEN (?)-K'I-LO)

The people of this region "were straight forward; they esteemed superior abilities and held learning in respect." Referring to the religious establishments the pilgrim tells us that "there were six or seven Buddhist monasteries and above 300 Brethren; the Deva-Temples were ten in number and the various systems lived pell-mell."[109]

PUṆḌRAVARDHANA (PUN-NA-FA-TAN-NA)

In this country, "there were twenty Buddhist monasteries and above 3000 Brethren by whom the Great and Little Vehicles were followed." But as compared to these monasteries the number of the Deva-Temples was much higher. We are told that they were "100 in number and the followers of the various sects lived pell-mell."[110] Among others "the Digambara Nirgranthas were very numerous."

---

107. *Ibid.*, *II*, *P.* 178.
108. *Ibid.*, *II*, *P.* 181.
109. *Ibid.*, *II*, *P.* 183.
110. *Ibid.*, *II*, *P.* 184.

KĀMARŪPA (KA-MO-LU-P'O)

This part of the country was one of those territories where Buddhism was not introduced. The pilgrim tells us that the people of this province "were persevering students; they worshipped the Devas, and did not believe in Buddhism. So there had never been a Buddhist monastery in the land, and whatever Buddhists there were in it performed their acts of devotion secretly; the Deva-Temples were some hundreds in number, and the various systems had some myriads of professed adherents."[111]

SAMATAṬA (SAN-MO-TA-T'O)

The country "had more than 30 Buddhist monasteries and above 2000 Brethren all adherents of Sthavira School." Here, too, the strength of non-Buddhists was great as we are told by the pilgrim that "there were 100 Deva-Temples, the various sects lived pell-mell, and the Digambara Nirgranthas were very numerous."[112]

TĀMRALIPTI (TAN-MO-LIH-TI)

The people of Tāmralipti are said to be "believers in Buddhism and other systems." Referring to the religious establishments the pilgrim tells us, "Of Deva -temples there were more than 50, and the non-Buddhists lived together pell-mell. There were above ten Buddhists monasteries and more than one thousand Brethren."[113] This description shows that Buddhism was weaker than other sects.

KARṆASUVARṆA (KIE(KA)-LO-NA-SU-FA-LA-NA)

The inhabitants of this region "were of good character and were patrons of learning." Referring to the monasteries and temples the pilgrim tells us, "there were more than ten Buddhist monasteries, and above 2000 Brethren who were all adherents of the Sammatīya School; there were 50 Deva-Temples and the followers of the various religions were very numerous."[114]

---

111. *Ibid., II, P.* 186.
112. *Ibid., II, P.* 187.
113. *Ibid., II, P.* 190.
114. *Ibid., II, P.* 191.

ODRA (WU-T'U)

The pilgrim informs that the people "were indefatigable students and many of them were Buddhists. There were above 100 Buddhist monasteries, and a myriad Brethren all Mahāyānists. Of Deva-Temples there were 50, and the various sects lived pell-mell."[115]

KOṄGODHA (KUNG-YU-(GU OR YA)-T'O)

The people of this territory "were not Buddhists. Deva-Temples were above 100 in number, and of Tīrthikas there were more than 10000."[116]

KALIṄGA (KA-LENG-KA)

"The people" of this country "were rude and headstrong in disposition, observant of good faith and fairness, fast and clear in speech. There were few Buddhists, the majority of the people being of other religions. There were above ten Buddhist monasteries, and 500 Brethren students of the Mahāyānist Sthavira School system."[117]

SOUTHERN KOŚALA

The pilgrim tells us that "the king was a Kṣatriya by birth, a Buddhist in religion, and of noted benevolence. There were above 100 Buddhist monasteries, and above 10000 Brethren, all Mahāyānists."[118]

ANDHRA (AN-TO-LO)

The pilgrim informs us that "there were twenty old Buddhist monasteries with more than 3000 Brethren."[119] He does not refer to the number of the Deva-Temples.

DHANAKAṬAKA ? (T'E-NA-KA-CHE-KA)

"There was a crowd of Buddhist monasteries but most of them

115. *Ibid., II, P.* 193.
116. *Ibid., II, P.* 196.
117. *Ibid., II, P.* 198.
118. *Ibid., II, P.* 200.
119. *Ibid., II, P.* 209.

were deserted, about twenty being in use, with 1000 Brethren mostly adherents of the Mahāsaṁghika system. There were above 100 Deva-Temples and the followers of the various sects were very numerous."[120]

CHULYA ? (CHOLA) (CHU-LI-YA)

The people are said to be "of fierce and profligate character and were believers in the Tīrthikas. The Buddhist monasteries were in ruins, and only some of them had Brethren; there were several tens of Deva-Temples, and the Digambaras were numerous."[121]

DRAVIḌ (TA-LO-P'I-T'U)

The people "were courageous, thoroughly trustworthy, and public-spirited, and they esteemed great learning....There were more than 100 Buddhist monasteries with above 10000 Brethren all of the Sthavira School. The Deva-Temples were 80, and the majority belonged to the Digambaras."[122]

MALAKŪṬA (MO-LO-KU-T'A)

The people "were harsh and impetuous, of mixed religions, indifferent to culture and only good at trade. There were many remains of old monasteries, very few monasteries were in preservation and there are only a small number of Brethren. There were hundreds of Deva-Temples, and the professed adherents of the various sects, especially, the Digambaras were very numerous."[123]

KOṄKAṆAPUR (KUNG-KIN OR (KAN)-NA-PU-LO)

We are told that "it had more than 100 Buddhist monasteries and above 10000 Brethren who were students of both Vehicles."[124] The pilgrim does not refer to the number of temples.

---

120. *Ibid., II, P.* 214.
121. *Ibid., II, P.* 224.
122. *Ibid., II, P.* 226.
123. *Ibid., II, P.* 228.
124. *Ibid., II, P.* 237.

MAHĀRĀṢṬRA (MO-HA-LA-CH'A)

The pilgrim informs us that the people were "fond of learning, and they combined orthodoxy and heterodoxy. Of Buddhist monasteries there were above 100 and the Brethren, who were adherents of both Vehicles, were more than 5000 in number."[125]

BHAROCH (PO-LU-KA-CHE-P'O)

The pilgrim does not appear to be happy with the people of Bharoch who, according to his records, "were mean and deceitful, ignorant and believers in both orthodoxy and heterodoxy." Referring to the religious establishments the pilgrim tells us that "there were above ten Buddhist monasteries with 300 Brethren all students of the Mahāyānist Sthavira School."[126] The pilgrim does not refer to the number of the Deva-Temples.

MĀLVĀ (MO-LA-P'O)

The pilgrim was very happy with the people of Mālvā. He tells us that they "were of a gently disposition, and for the most part very intelligent, of refined speech and with a liberal education. Mo-la-p'o in the south-west and Magadha in the north-east, were the two countries of India in which learning was prized. In this country virtue was esteemed and humanity respected, and the intellectually clear were zealous students; there was miscellaneous belief in orthodoxy and heterodoxy."[127] Referring to the religious establishments the pilgrim tells us that "there were some hundreds of monasteries, and more than 20,000 Brethern belonging to the Sammatīya School of the Hīnayāna; of the Deva-Temples there were some hundreds, and the adherents of the various sects were very numerous, the majority being Pāśupatas."[128]

---

125. *Ibid., II, P.* 239.
126. *Ibid., II, P.* 241.
127. *Ibid., II, P.* 242.
128. *Ibid., II, P.* 242.

ATLI ? A-T'A (OR CH'A)-LI

"The people", tells the pilgrim, "were mean-spirited bring wealth....; the majority did not believe in happiness (i.e. religious merit) but there were some who did; they worshipped Devas and of Deva-Temples there were some more than ten;[129] the followers of the various systems lived pell-mell."[130] This shows that the Buddhists did not enjoy any following in this country.

KACHCHHA (K'I-T'A)

We are told that "there were above ten Buddhist monasteries with more than 1000 Brethren who were adherents of both Vehicles;" and "there were numerous members of other religions, with several tens of Deva-Temples."[131] Thus the district appears to have a majority of non-Buddhists.

VALABHĪ (FA-LA-P'I)

The country "had above 100 Buddhist monasteries with 6000 Brethren adherents of the Hīnayāna Sammatīya School; of Deva-Temples there were some hundreds, and the adherents of the various systems were very numerous."[132]

ĀNANDPURA (A-NAN-T'O-PU-LO)

The country had "more than ten monasteries with nearly 1000 Brethren belonging to the Hīnayānist Sammatīya School."[133] The pilgrim does not refer to the number of Deva-Temples.

SŪRAT (SU-LA-CH'A)

The people "were of a rude violent nature......and their belief embraced orthodoxy and heterodoxy." Referring to the religious estab-

---

129. *According to D. B. text, more than* 1000. *Watters, Ibid., P.* 244.
130. *Ibid., II, P.* 244.
131. *Ibid., II, P.* 245.
132. *Ibid., II, P.* 246.
133. *Ibid., II, P.* 247.

lishments the pilgrim tells us that "there were more than 50 monasteries with above 3000 Brethren, the majority being students of the Mahāyānist Sthavira system; the Deva-Temples were above hundred in number, and the sectarians lived pell-mell."[134]

GURJARA KINGDOM (KU-CHE-LO)

This country "had a flourishing population in good circumstances mostly non-Buddhists, only a few believing in Buddhism." This is further confirmed from the number of religious establishments. According to the pilgrim, "there was only one Buddhist monastery with above 100 Brethren who were adherents of the Hīnayānist Sarvāstivādin School. There were some tens of Deva-Temples, and the adherents of various religions lived pell-mell."[135]

UJJAIN (WU-SHE-YEN-NA)

The pilgrim tells us that "there were some tens of Buddhist monasteries, of which the majority were in ruins, and only three or four were in a state of preservation; the Brethren, who were students of both 'Vehicles,' were above 300 in number; there were some tens of Deva-Temples, and the non-Buddhists lived pell-mell."[136]

JAJHOTI (CHIH-CHI-T'O)

The pilgrim informs us that "the majority of the people were not Buddhists, but there were some tens of monasteries with a few Brethren; there were above ten Deva-Temples and 1000 professed adherents of the other systems."[137]

MAHEŚVARAPURA (MO-HI-SSU-FA-LO-PU-LO)

The pilgrim tells us that "the people were not Buddhists;

---

134. *Ibid., II, P.* 248.
135. *Ibid., II, P.* 249.
136. *Ibid., II, P.* 251.
137. *Ibid., II, P.* 251.

there were a few Deva-Temples, and the majority belonged to the Pāśupatas."[138]

SINDHA (SIN-TU)

We are told that "the inhabitants were quick-tempered but upright, quarrelsome and vituperative and of superficial learning; they were thorough believers in Buddhism." Referring to the religious establishments he tells us that "there were several hundreds of monasteries and above 10000 Brethren all of the Hīnayānist Sammatīya School. Most of these were in dolent worthless persons; of the superior Brethren who, leading lives of lonely seclusion, never relaxed in perseverence, many attained arhatship. There were above thirty Deva-Temples and the various sectarians lived pell-mell."[139]

CONVOCATION OF A BUDDHIST ASSEMBLY AT KANAUJ

This Buddhist assembly was convened at Kānyakubja[140] "to give the utmost publicity to the doctrines of the Mahāyāna Buddhism."[141] Invitations were sent to all the disciples of the various Schools throughout India. It was attended by four thousand priests and three thousand Brāhmaṇas and Nirgranthas. The conference was inaugurated by Harṣa who requested Yuan Chuang to preside over the discussion. First of all Yuan Chuang dwelt on the merits of the "Great Vehicle" and "fixed a subject for discussion." He challenged the assembled members to come forward even with "a single word in the propostion contrary to reason"; but none could accept the challenge and the pilgrim "remained in an

---

138. *Ibid., II, P.* 251.

139. *Ibid., II, P.* 252.

140. *The proceedings of the assembly are picturesquely described by the learned author of the History of Kanauj. Pp.* 151-157. *What I intend to do here is to give a brief summary in order to avoid unnecessary repititions. Dr. Tripathi has based his description on Sī-yū-ki and Life.*

141. *THK., P.* 151; *also Life, P.* 17.

undisputed possession of the field." For five days the business remained at a stand still and then the Hīnayānists conspired to assassinate Yuan Chuang. The plot, however, leaked out and after Harṣa's threatenining proclamation, they being humiliated disappeared. Thus after eighteen days the proceedings came to an end. And the pilgrim emerged as a great and unrivalled champion of the 'Great Vehicle' with enhanced prestige.

QUINQUENNIAL DISTRIBUTIONS AT PRAYĀGA

Yuan Chuang's biographer informs us that the pilgrim attended another grand ceremony which Harṣa held at Prayāga. The pilgrim was told by Harṣa that the latter had held five great quinquennial distributions during the last thirty years. This distribution ceremony was called the Mahā-Mokṣa Pariṣada at which the sovereign distributed alms to all those persons who assembled to receive the gifts. At the sixth Pariṣada about half a million people were summoned. They consisted of Śramaṇas, heretics, Nirgranthas, the poor and the orphans. Proper arrangements were made for their boarding and lodging. At this occasion all the feudatories and the allies were also invited.

The ceremony was inaugurated with the worship of the image of Buddha; on the second day the image of Sun was worshipped and on the third day Śiva "received the adoration." On the fourth day the distribution ceremony was begun. The gifts consisted of gold, silver, pearls, precious stones and clothes of silk and cotton. At this sixth occasion Harṣa is said to have distributed all his precious ornaments and valuables. When nothing was left with him, Harṣa begged from Rājyaśrī "an ordinary second-hand garment", and having put it on, he paid worship to the Buddhas of the ten regions. He also distributed the costly presents which he received from the assembled kings. Thus Harṣa appears to have "established a record of individual charity and liberality hardly equalled in history."[142]

142. *THK.*, *P.* 161.

KAMRMAKĀṆḌA (SAṀSAKĀRAS)

Broadly speaking the Saṁskāras are observed in almost all the countries and by all the cultured races with some variations and adjustments according to particular conditions; but among the Hindus they are universally recognized and occupy a significant position in our social and cultural environment. In a life of a Hindu the Saṁskāras are pre-eminently important from the craddle to grave. The literature at our disposal throws enough light on the earnest observance of these Saṁskāras and on that basis we are in a position to conclude that the Karmakāṇḍa enjoyed great place in our society.

SAṀSKĀRAS BEGINNING FROM BIRTH TO INITIATION

Bāṇa informs us that "before he reached the age of fourteen, he had passed through initiation (*Upanayana*) and other associated ceremonies including the Saṁskāra of Samāvartana" (end of student life).[143] His father is also said to have died after having performed in full the sacred duties usually found among the Brāhmaṇas as enjoined in the Śrutis and Smṛitis.[144] The Brāhmaṇas appear to have been especially interested in the observance of the ceremonial sacraments and they felt due pride for them. When Harṣa addressed Bāṇa as Bhujaṅga, the latter was annoyed and informed the former that "every ceremony was duly performed, as its time came, beginning with the investiture with the sacred thread."[145] These Saṁskāras were not only observed by the pious Brāhmaṇas; but they were also honoured by the people of other Varṇas. In the Kādambarī we are told that Chandrapīḍa "had undergone in due course all the circle of ceremonies beginning with the tying of the top-knot (*Chuḍākaraṇa*)."[146] The purpose of this Saṁskāra was the achievement of long life for the child.[147] Bāṇa is silent about the main constituents of this circle but some of them are

143. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 23; *HCK.*, *Can. I*, *P.* 19.
144. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 33.
145. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 66; *HCK.*, *Can.* 2, *P.* 36.
146. *Kādambarī*, *tr. Ridding*, *P.* 59; *KP.*, *P.* 167.
147. *HS.*, *Pp.* 158-171.

mentioned elsewhere. He informs us that on the tenth day of the birth of Mahāśvetā her father with the customary rites gave her the name of Mahāśvetā.[148] In the same way Vaiśampāyana's father performed all the rites at son's birth and named him Vaiśampāyana. The marriage was also looked upon as a sacramental duty. Prabhākaravardhana is said to have performed the customary ceremonies after seeing the dream.[149] Most probably Bāṇa indicates towards the garbhādhāna ceremony.

Other Saṁskāras were also performed and we have casual references to them all and we can safely say that all the Saṁskāras were observed with great care and attention.

THE FUNERAL CEREMONY (ANTYEṢṬI)

It is the last ceremony in the life of a Hindu. Bāṇa gives us full details how this last Saṁskāra was performed during the age of Harṣavardhana. When Prabhākaravardhana died his funeral took place in a ceremonial way. The feudatories and the townsmen "headed by the family priests, taking upon proffered shoulders, the bier of the king took it to the bank of Sarasvatī."[150] Then the bier was placed upon a pyre and the fire was lit which "consumed the corpse." From a passage in the Kādambarī it seems probable that there were three popular practices for the disposal of the corpses; they were either by burning or by throwing it into the water or allow it to be deserted.[151] But the popular way was the burning it, and the sacrificial fire by which the corpse was disposed, was taken to the crematorium. Other instances of inhumation or burial are not found in that period.

After the funeral was over the members who joined the funeral procession took "funeral bath."[152] The people of the family of the deceased

---

148. *Kādambarī, tr. Ridding, P.* 103.

149. *HCCTH., P.* 106.

150. *HCCTH., P.* 158.

151. *Kādambarī, tr. Ridding, P.* 195; *Kādambarī, ed. Parab, P.* 628.

152. *HCCTH., P.* 160.

did not sleep on beds. Bāṇa informs us that Harṣa passed the sleepless night with the princes on the uncushioned ground.[153]

The next ceremony that was associated with funeral was the Udakaṁ or Udakakarma[154] or the offering of water to the dead. From the Harṣacharita we know that prince Harṣa went to the Sarasvatī's bank on the second day after the cremation and after having bathed in the river he offered water to his deceased father.[155] Then a Brāhmaṇa, who took the first oblation offering, was fed first of all.[156] The impurity due to the death lasted for ten days. Manu also maintains that the first ten days are impure and on the eleventh day impurity passes away.[157] After the impurity passed away the personal belongings of the deceased were given to the Brāhmaṇas.[158] We know that the beds, chairs, chowries, umbrellas, vessels, carriages and swords of Prabhākaravardhana were distributed to the Brāhmaṇas.

The bones and relics of the deceased were taken to the sacred places (*Tīrthasthānāni*) and a monument of bricks was raised up on the spot where the funeral had taken place.

Another noteworthy development of this period was the remarkable growth of popular beliefs in the heaven and hell and we find the significance of rewards and punishments respectively according to the acts of omission and commission. Another popular belief was in the progressive application of the doctrines of rebirth. Bāṇa gives a vivid description of these popular beliefs while describing the sickness and death of king Prabhākaravardhana in the fifth chapter of the Harṣacharita.[159]

---

153. *Ibid., P.* 158.

154. *HS., P.* 446.

155. *HCCTH., P.* 160; *HCK., Can.* 5, *P.* 34; *Rid : Kād.,* 194; *KP., P.* 624.

156. *HCCTH., P.* 164; *HCK., Can.* 6, *P.* 36.

157. *MS.,* 5. 59.

158. *HCCTH.,* 164; *Rid : Kād., P;* 195. *The learned translators of the Harṣacharita maintain that "Nṛipatikaṭopakarṇa" stands for "the various appurtenances of the royal bier." The term actually denotes the personal belongings of the deceased. HCK., Can. VI, Notes, Pp.* 114-5.

159. *HCCTH., Pp.* 135-160; *HCK., P.* 19-35.

The penances were common according to specific breaches of the sacred rules which are laid down in the Smṛitis. This faith in the performances of ceremonial rites and penances naturally enhanced the social importance and status of the Brāhmaṇas, who alone were worthy of conducting various types of these rites and penances and performed worship for the people.

On the eleventh day after the death of Prabhākaravardhana the royal elephent was also let loose in the woods.[160] Mr. Kāṇe informs that even now on the eleventh or the twelfth day after the death, a bull is let loose for the dead in some parts of India.[161]

LIFE AT THE HERMITAGE (TAPOVANA OR ĀŚRAMA)

At a number of places in Bāṇa's works and Harṣa's own dramas we find complete picture of an individual's life as it was led at the hermitage. It was built at beautiful natural sites in the forests. These penance-groves were not only the centres of meditation and penance; but they were renowned places of learning and study. The aged and contented sages were devoted to study and teaching. They discussed the doubtful passages of the Vedic texts and other Śāstras. Students learnt their lessons and recited the Vedas.[162] At the hermitages sacrifices were performed, and they are described as full of sacrificial smoke.[163] The young students brought the fire-wood (Samidhāḥ) and the hermit-girls (*Tāpasakumārikāḥ*) watered the young plants and looked after the āśrama animals.

The eating places of the sages were protected from pollution by ashes which were cast round them. The Pitṛis were honoured and almost all gods were worshipped; the performance of Śrāddha rite was taught to young disciples; the science of sacrifice was explained; the Śāstras of right

---

160. *HCCTH., P.* 164.

161. *HCK., Can. VI., Notes, P.* 116.

162. *Kādambarī, tr. Ridding, Pp.* 38, 18-24 ; *Nāg., P.* 14; *HCCTH., Pp.* 236-37.

163. *Nāgānandam., P.* 14; *Priyā., P.* 4; *Rid: Kād., P.* 24.

conduct were examined; ground courts were besmeared with cow-dung; meditation was firmly grasped; mantras were duly learned; yoga was practised and offereings were made to deities. Wandering ascetics were received hospitably. There were impartial discussions on various topics relating to the philosophical problems.

Deer-skins and Kuśā-grass were used for mats and the strips of barks were put on by the hermitage-girls and students. They possessed begging-bowls and gathered the forest fruits. Their diet consisted of roots, fruits and the juice of fruits.[164]

At these āśramas a strict code of conduct was observed. What Kapiñjala spoke to Puṇḍarīka, throws light on the strict code of conduct and morality that was observed by young students. He says to his friend who was losing his self-control due to passion, "....Where is thy firmness, thy conquest of senses, thy self-control, thy calmness of mind, thy inherited holiness and thy carelessness of worldly things ? Where is the teaching of thy Guru, thy learning of the Vedas, thy resolve of asceticism, thy hatred of pleasure, thy passion for penance, thy distaste for enjoyment and thy control over the impulses of youth ?" The trusted friend further warns, "If you do not observe self-control, all knowledge is fruitless; study of the holy books is worthless; initiations (Saṁskāras) are meaningless and the solemn teaching of the Gurus is useless..."[165] Munis, too, saw to it that all duties were carefully performed.

SOME POPULAR SUPERSTITIONS AND BELIEFS

In almost all the countries and during all times people believe in some thing or other which prognosticates the future happenings and coming incidents. With the development of science and technology people have developed a scientific outlook and they have begun to disapprove the genuineness of the various beliefs and superstitions; but these beliefs, though inexplicable, are not entirely baseless. Some of the omens do bring the expected results and some branches of modern psychology, too, approve

164. *Rid* : *Kād.*, *Pp.* 35-44. *ff.*
165. *Ibid.*, *Pp.* 111-12; *KP.*, *Pp.* 313-14.

of them. In the scientific world superstitions are coming in a new and more complicated way. Dr. Aldous Huxley appears to be right when he observes that the form is changed but substance has remained unchanged.[166] With this view in mind we shall now refer to various popular superstitions and beliefs as we find during the period under review.

THE THROBBING OF AN EYE

In the seventh century people believed in omens, and other indications. Throbbing of an eye was commonly regarded as an important indication in those days and we find the same belief today also. Throbbing of the right eye of a man was supposed to be a good omen for him. In the Nāgānandaṁ we are told that when the right eye of the hero throbbed, he expressed that he had no desire for any boon; but the words of the wise could not be untrue.[167] But the throbbing of the left eye was considered as an indication of some comig unfortunate event.[168] In the cases of women it was vice versa.[169]

People also believed in the prophecies of fortune-tellers and sooth-sayers. Queen Vilāsavatī welcomed fortune-tellers and sooth-sayers and showed respect to the people who understood the omens of birds.[170]

COMMENCEMENT OF A JOURNEY AT AN AUSPICIOUS MOMENT

People were used to embark upon a journey at an auspicious moment. In the Harṣacharita we find a vivid descriptions of Bāṇa's preparation for his journey to Harṣa's camp. On that occasion of his departure he repeatedly recited the hymns from the sacred texts which were usually recited at such occasions.[171] Bāṇa worshipped the Lord Śiva with

---

166. *Dr. Huxley's Essay on 'Superstitions'.*
167. *Nāgānandaṁ*, 1. 10.
168. *Ibid.*, 5. 4.; *HCCTH., Pp.* 133, 177.
169. *Rid* : *Kād., P.* 125; *KP., P.* 343; *HCCTH., P.* 248.
170. *Kādambarī, tr. Ridding, P.* 56.
171. *HCCTH., P.* 44; *HCK., Canto* 2, *P.* 25.

complete rituals and, then after having worshipped Agni, he distributed wealth according to his means to the Brāhmaṇas.[172] Then he walked solemnly round a sacred cow which faced the east;[173] he was decked with white unguents and was wearing white garlands and white garments. Then he adorned his ears with girikarṇikā flowers, fastened with the ends dūrvā-grass, and covered with rochana paint and having white mustard put on his topknot.[174] Bāṇa was a true believer in the omens and we are informed that his eagerness for starting increased with the good omens.[175] In a favourable moment, "looking upon a full water-jar" that was placed in the court-yard, which was "besmeard with cow-dung" and "with a mango-spray placed on its mouth", Bāṇa managed to start. There is a detailed description of the water-jar in the Harṣacharita. It was "white with five finger-breadths of flour" and its "neck was encircled by a garland of white flowers."

Bāṇa paid homage to the family-deities. Then, followed by Brāhmaṇas and kinsmen with their hands holding flowers and fruits and muttering the "apratirath hymn" he went out from the village of Prītikūṭa setting his right foot first.[176]

Expeditionary missions were also inaugarated with auspcious signs and celebrations. After his consecration, when prince Chandrapīḍa went on an expedition for digvijaya, his elephent was adorned with all auspicious signs for the journey.[177] Vaiśaṁpāyana also performed some auspicious rites before coming to accompany Chandrapīḍa.[178]

BELIEF IN AUSPICIOUS MARKS AND SIGNS

People believed in auspicious marks and signs. Bāṇa says that

172. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 44.; *HCK.*, *P.* 25.
173. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 44; *HCK.*, *P.* 25.
174. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 44.
175. *Ibid.*, *P.* 45; *HCK.*, *P.* 26.
176. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 45; *HCK.*, *Can.* 2, *P.* 26.
177. *Kādambarī*, *tr. Ridding*, *P.* 86.
178. *Ibid.*, *P.* 87.

Harṣa bore signs which told of his high sovereignty over the four oceans. These auspicious marks consisted of the lotus, the shell, the fish and the makara.[179] The right hand of Divākaramitra is said to have been "graced with all the lines and marks of a great man."[180]

BELIEF IN STRENGTH OF OMENS

The Harṣacharita and the Kādambarī throw enough light on the general beliefs and superstitions which prevailed among the people during the period under review. Therein we are told that by an omen the approaching of luck is clearly revealed in the world.[181] In the Harṣacharita we are told that "as the dawn announces the arrival of the sun and the very rapid wind that of the rain, so the appearance of a previous shadow or vision foretells the arrival of the good or evil happenings.

DAYS OF GOOD OMEN

Some days in a week were also looked upon as the days of good omen. We learn that the betrothal ceremony of princess Rājyaśrī was performed on the days of a good omen.[182]

SOME GENERAL BELIEFS

The neighing of a horse was regarded as a symbol of joy and good omen. Bāṇa informs us that when Harṣa was born the horses neighed in the stable.[183] In the temples of the sacrificers, the unfed Vaitāna fire blazed up with flames to the right to foretell the coming of good luck.[184]

A deer passing from the right to the left was an evil omen. On his way back home, Harṣa is said to have seen a deer crossing the road from the right to the left.[185] This foreshadowed the approaching end of the

179. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 91; *HCK.*, *Canto* 3, *P.* 50.
180. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 238; *HCK.*, *Can.* 8, *P.* 74.
181. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 106.
182. *;bid.*, *P.* 103; *HCK.*, *Can.* 4, *P.* 13.
183. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 110; *HCK.*, *Can.* 4, *P.* 6.
184. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 110. *HCK.*, *Can.* 4, *P.* 6.
185. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 134.

lion king (his father). But a deer passing from the left to the right indicated victory or joy.

In the Harṣacharita we are told that a crow was seen sitting on a burnt tree facing the Sun's flaming circle and uttering its dreadful cries.[186] When Harṣa saw it his heart began to sink because it foreshadowed his father's death.

A naked ascetic bedecked with peacock's tail-feathers was also regarded as an evil omen.[187]

Bāṇa informs us that those inauspicious signs at the time of departure "deepened the prince's apprehensions. The flocks of the crows roaming over Harṣa's head and their crowing harshly in the day time announced the approach of the calamity."[188]

SUPERSTITIOUS MEASURES TO REMOVE PHYSICAL PAINS

We are told in the Harṣacharita that at the time of Prabhākaravardhana's sickness we find many superstitious measures being done in order to remove pains and suffering of the king. Young nobles were "burning themselves with the lamps to propitiate the circle of mothers" (*mātṛimaṇḍalaṁ*) in order to get relief for the ailing monarch.[189] His kinsmen and relatives "went on a fast to appease Ahirbudhana" (Śiva) and lay before his image.[190] People from different parts of India were called upon to perform various rites. Bāṇa informs of a Draviḍian who was "ready to solicit Amardakaṁ with the offering of a skull."[191] Another person was from Āndhra who was "holding up his arms like a rampart to conciliate Chaṇḍī"; "distressed servants were pacifying Mahākāla by holding melting gum on their heads; some of the relatives were busy in offering an oblation

---

186. *Ibid., P.* 134; *HCK., Can.* 5, *P.* 20.
187. *HCCTH., P.* 134.
188. *Ibid., P.* 135; *HCK., Can.* 5, *P.* 21.
189. *HCCTH., P.* 135; *HCK., Can.* 5, *P.* 21.
190. *HCCTH., P.* 135; *HCK., P.* 21.
191. *HCCTH., P.* 135; *HCK., P.* 21.

of their own flesh which they servered with sharp knives;[192] young courtiers were encouraging the sale of human flesh."[193]

Attempts were also made for the preservation and prolongation of the life of a diseased person. Some people were engaged in cooking the ambrosial posset (*amṛitacharu*).[194] The latter was the preparation of milk, ghee and rice or barley to be offered to the gods as a life-preservative presentation.[195] Some people were performing the six oblation sacrifice (*ṣaḍāhūtihomaṁ*). This sacrifice is offered to the six devas. They are Prajāpati, Soma, Agni, Indra, Dyāvāpṛithvī and Dhanvantarī.[196] Some people were "busy chanting the Mātṛi-Māyūrī hymn to purify the household; some were offering tremuolus Dūrvā-leaves besmeared with clotted butter; some were completing the rites for keeping out the evil spirits by offerings; Brāhmaṇas were engaged in reciting the Vedic texts; the temple of Śiva was resounded with the repetition of the Rudraikādaśi hymns;[197] the image of Śiva was being bathed with thousands of milk jars by great and holy devotees of Śiva."[198]

Some measures were also taken up to satisfy the hunger and thirst of the diseased. When Prabhākaravardhana was sick the attendents were drinking water from cups "in order to distract the pain of the king's dry mouth";[199] and "gourmands were being fed to relieve his hunger."[200]

---

192. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 135; *HCK.*, *Can.* 5, *P.* 21.

193. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 136.

194. *Ibid.*, *P.* 137.

195. *HCK.*, *Notes on Can. V*, *P.* 73; *HCCTH.*, *P.* 137.

196. *HCK. P.* 73.

197. *The Rudraikādaśi is a prayer in eleven anuvākas addressed to Rudra. Great merit is supposed to result from repeating that prayer for* 11 *or* 121 *times. HCK., Can. V, Notes, P.* 73.

198. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 137; *HCK.*, *Can. V*, *P.* 21.

199. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 138; *HCK.*, *Can. V*, *P.* 22.

200. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 138; *HCK.*, *Can. V*, *P.* 22.

BELIEFS IN EVIL SPIRITS AND GHOSTS

People had full belief in the might of evil spirits and their disastrous designs. They did all to keep them out of their houses. Various rites were performed and offerings were made to them in order to appease them. It was also attempted to please the demons by narrating their power and courage. Bāṇa informs us that one of the servants of Prabhākaravardhana was telling the stories of demons, while others were completing various rites and were making offerings to please them.[201]

SOME EVIL OMENS WHICH PROGNOSTICATED DISASTER

Bāṇa informs us that the headless trunk is said to have been seen in the disc of the sun and thus Rāhū was as if provided with a complete body when it seized the sun."[202] These dreadful indications were noticed before the news of Rājyavaradhana's treacherous assassination reached Sthāṇvīśvara. In the Bṛihata Saṁhitā we are informed that if such stuff is seen in the sun the sovereign is sure to die.[203] Harṣa is said to have seen the Seven Sages emitting eruptions of smoke.[204] Every day he saw calamitious flames in the heaven.[205] The star groups fell from the firmament like pieces of ark from the burning substance.[206] These are some of the evil signs which prophesied the murder of Rājyavardhana. In the midst of these horrors Harṣa says, "I see no fair auspice in this hour....In any case, be it well with my lord."[207]

BELIEF IN VARIOUS RITES WHICH WERE ESPECIALLY PERFORMED TO BE BLESSED WITH A SON

A woman feels her life to be fruitful when she gives birth to a child.

201. *HCCTH.*, 137-38; *HCK.*, *V*, *P.* 22.
202. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 177.
203. *HCK.*, *Can. V*, *Notes*, *Pp.* 135-36.
204. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 177; *HCK.*, *Can. V*;, *P.* 43.
205. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 177; *HCK.*, *Can. V*;, *P.* 43.
206. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 177; *HCK.*, *Can. V*;, *P.* 43.
207. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 177; *HCK.*, *Can. V*;, *P.* 43.

Without a child in her lap she is utterly miserable and to her the whole life is meaningless. Among all the women we find the predominance of this natural instinct throughtout the ages. The women of any age are no exception to this generally accepted instinct.

During the times of Harṣavardhana they practised many such things in order to be blessed with sons. Queen Vilāsavatī is depicted in the Kādambarī as childless. She was ready to sacrifice any thing in order to bear a child. She was devoted in propitiating the gods, honouring the Brāhmaṇas and paying reverence to gurus; whatever recommendation she heard from any source, she practised it in her longing for a child, nor did she count any trouble; she slept in the temple of Durga on a bed of wood covered with green grass; she bathed under cows with auspicious marks; every day she rose early in the morning and offered gifts to the Brāhmaṇa; she stood in the midst of a circle drawn by the king himself in a place where four roads met; on the fourteenth night of the dark fortnight she performed an auspicious rite of bathing and all gods of the quarters (digdevatāni) were gladdened by the offerings and oblations; she honoured the shrines of Siddhas and took bath in all the snakeponds; she gave offerings to birds and offered daily to the goddess Durgā a sacrifice consisting of various things; she showed reverence to naked and wandering ascetics; listened to the Vedas and she did all that was possible for her and which prevailed in that age.[208] She is said to have thrown out "lumps of flesh in the evening for jackals;" she "honoured the directions of fortune-tellers and frequently welcomed the sooth-sayers."[209]

SOME TOTEMIC BELIEFS AMONG WOMEN

Women put on a necklace-cord in their neck during the days of advanced pregnancy. We know that Yaśomatī wore a necklace-cord (*Grīvāsūtra*) in the bust of which many precious jewels and other things were fixed.[210]

---

208. *Kādambarī, tr. Ridding, Pp.* 55-56; *KP., Pp.* 144-46.
209. *Kādambarī, tr. Ridding, Pp.* 144-6.
210. *HCCTH., P.* 109; *HCK., Ban. IV, P.* 6.

In the Harṣacharita we find one peculiar custom which was associated with the pregnant women of those days. In the birth-month a pregnant woman was brought from her husband's home to that of her father.[211] But this must not be taken as a rigid and strict rule for we know Harṣa, Rājyavardhana and Rājyaṣri were born at their father's home. Chandrapīḍa was also born at his father's palace. When a child was born it was adorned with many auspicious ornaments which protected it against evil looks (*dīṭhi*). Bāṇa informs us that Harṣa's neck was ornamented by a row of great tiger's claws linked with gold.[212]

BELIEF IN DREAMS

During the age of Harṣavardhana we find the complete application of the theory of the dreams of prognostication. As the coming clouds cast their shadow before the dreams prognosticated the future occurrences. In Bāṇa's works, Harṣa's dramas and other contemporary works including the records of the Chinese pilgrim we find a number of examples of such dreams. Such prognosticating dreams were seen at the end of the night.

One night when the dawn was drawing near the king Tārāpīḍa saw in a dream the full moon entering the mouth of Vilāsavatī.[213] Thereupon, filled with joy, he told his dream to his minister Śukanāsa and the latter analysed it in the following words, "Sir, our wishes and those of the subjects are at length fulfilled."[214] Then he told his own dream in which he saw a white-robed Brāhmaṇa of god-like appearance and calm aspect who placed a lotus in Manoramā's (Śukanāsa's wife) lap.[215] These two dreams foretold the births of Chandrapīḍa and Vaiśampāyana respectively. Śukanāsa informed the king in generalized way that the dreams seen at the close of the night are sure to bear fruits in future.[216] Queen Yaśomatī also

211. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 25; *HCK.*, *Can. I*, *P.* 11.
212. *HCK.*, *Can. IV*, *P.* 9.
213. *Kādambarī*, *tr. Ridding*, *Pp.* 56-57; *KP.*, *P.* 146.
214. *Kādambarī*, *tr. Ridding*, *P.* 57; *KP.*, *P.* 147.
215. *Kādambarī*, *tr. Ridding*, *P.* 57; *KP.*, *P.* 147.
216. *Kādambarī*, *tr. Ridding*, *P.* 57; *KP.*, *P.* 147.

saw in a dream two shining youths coming from the Sun's disc and they were associated by one maid like a moon incarnate. They cut the womb of the queen and entered into it.[217] It was thus that the birth of Rājyavardhana, Harṣavardhana and Rājyaśrī was foretold.

Sometimes the people were blessed by gods and goddesses, in dreams. In the Nāgānandaṁ, we are informed, the goddess Gaurī blessed Malayavatī that a paramount sovereign of the Vidyādharas should take her hand in marriage.[218] We know in the later part of the drama that this dream came true. Jīmūtavāhana also saw a dream in which he saw his beloved.[219]

Future disasters also cast their symbolic shadows through dreams. While Harṣa was enjoying hunting in the Himālayas, he saw in a dream a lion being burnt in the overpowering forest fire. He also saw lioness jumping into that flame leaving her cubs.[220] It is very easy to analyse this dream wherein Prabhākaravardhana is represented as a lion, Yaśomatī as a lioness and their children as cubs.

At the time of Prabhākaravardhana's sickness one man was recounting bad dreams.[221] We are also informed by Bāṇa that Harṣa was foretold of Rājyavardhana's death in a vision.[222]

Yuan Chuang also records some dreams which were seen by the people.[223] While the pilgrim was on his way to India, a priest in the temple of Maitreya had a dream about the pilgrim[224]. The priests of the Hushkara (*U-ssc-kia-lo*) had also seen a vision in the dream which foretold them about Yuan Chuang and his mission.[225] But as far as the pilgrim himself was concerned he regarded dreams as vain and deceptive.[226]

217. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 105.
218. *Nāgā.*, *Act. I*, P. 22.
219. *Ibid.*, *P.* 47.
220. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 133.
221. *Ibid.*, *P.* 137.
222. *Ibid.*, *P.* 177.
223. *Life.*, *Pp.* 14-15 *ff.*
224. *Ibid.*, *Pp.* 14*ff.*
225. *Life.*, *Pp.* 68-69.
226. *Ibid.*, *P.* 15.

BELIEF IN THE MIGHT OF FORTUNE AND FATE

Belief in the might of fate has been noticed in all ages and among all races of the world, but in the case of an Indian it is characteristically significant. People in the seventh century A.D. are represented as believing in the fate. In the Kādambarī king Tārāpīḍa is represented as a fatalist. To his wife, who was extremely unhappy without a son, he says, "what can be done in a matter decreed by fate ?" He further observes that even the wisest man cannot change the destiny.[227] In the Harṣacharita we are told by Rājyaśrī's maid-servant that her "heart was bewildered by the continually fresh calamities inflicted on her by accursed fortune."[228] The two opening verses of the fifth canto speak of the predominant role of fate and its cruelties in human life.[229] Yuan Chuang also informs us that "near the capital of Nagarahāra (*Na-kie-lo-ho*) there was a double storeyed building and in the upper storey there was a small stūpa which contained the bone of the head of the Tathāgata...If any one desired to know the indication of his guilt or religious merits, he mixed some powdered incense into a paste, which he spread upon a piece of a silken stuff and then pressed it on the top of the bone. According to the resulting indications the good or ill fortune was determined."[230] But it would be far from the truth to conclude that the pople were merely fatalists. They were also true believers in the philosophy of the Bhagvadgītā wherein we find the immortal message of Karmayoga. When the royal seal fell from Harṣa's hand on the eve of his departure for world conquest, he did not lose his heart, though it was regarded as an ill omen. Harṣa gave his own interpretation of the incident.

BELIEF IN OATH AND SOME WAYS OF SWEARING

Belief in the effect of oath is very old and it has drawn the attention of certain scholars who have made a thorough study of oath, its effect and

---

227. *Kādambarī, tr. Ridding, P.* 53; *KP., Pp.* 139-140
228. *HCCTH., P.* 245.
229. *HCK., Can.* 5, *Verse I* and *II, P.* 19.
230. *Life., P.* 59.

its various ways of swearing.[231] In the Hindu literature we find a number of examples of swearing by gods and goddesses, by truth, merit, learning, fire, the sun, the moon and by other things that one cherishes dearly. During the age of Harṣavardhana we find some of these ways of swearing. In the Ratnāvali the Jester swears by his Brāhmanical thread.[232] In the same drama we are informed that by the oaths (*Śapathaiḥ*) the anger of the queen was considerably softened.[233] In some cases people used to swear by the feet of some one near and dear. Harṣa swore by the dust of his honoured lord's feet.[234] Swearing by the feet was to swear by the person and this person is, generally speaking, near and dear to one who swears by the former's feet.

---

231. *JAOS., Vol. Lii*, 1932, *Pop.* 316-337. '*The oath on Hindu Literature' by E. W. Hopkins of the Yale University.*

232. *Rat., Act. II, P.* 188.

233. *Ibid.*, 4-65.

234. *HCCTH., P.* 167: *HCK., Can.* 6, *P.* 47.

CHAPTER XII

LANGUAGE AND LITERATURE

ASCENDANCY OF SANSKRIT THROUGHOUT THE AGES

It is almost universally accepted that Sanskrit is the oldest language of the Aryans and that it has undergone a gradual process of linguistic development and modifications. The gifted grammarians endeavoured to remove its irregularities and enabled it to be preserved in its "purity and well-ordered nature which would otherwise have been impossible." The very word "Sanskrit" denotes its "purified" and "well-ordered" nature. Due to the joint efforts of distinguished Sanskrit grammarians like Pāṇini, Kātyāyana and Patañjali the Sanskrit language is said to have "attained a stereotyped form" which remained the same throughout the centuries.[1] Except the Pāli of the Buddhists and the Prākṛita of the Jains, it was the only medium through which all the brilliant brains of this holy land expressed their best thoughts and deepend experiences for the last two to three thousand years; it alone has brought about the cultural and emotional unification and an universal integration of Indian culture. It has given out culture a "synchronous form" inspite of general differences of popular speech, and racial geographical, economical and other differences.[2] Inspite of various religious sects and philosophical systems it has preserved a national unity among the Hindus for it has been the unifying link of all the religous and secular cultures.[3]

SANSKRIT AS WRITTEN AND SPOKEN LANGUAGE

From the inscriptions, popular literature, contemporary literary

1. *HSL, I, Pre., Pp. V-VI.*
2. *HSL., I, Pref., P. VII.*
3. *Ibid., P. VII.*

creations and the accounts of the Chinese pilgrim we can unhesitatingly conclude that the Sanskrit was the main language of the period. According to Bühler the language of the Banskhera plate is 'very good' and 'correct' Sanskrit.[4] Though the language of the Madhuban plate is not better than that of Banskhera, it is also 'good Sanskrit.'[5] The study of popular literature and that of various religious texts reveal that the Sanskrit was the common language used among the higher classes and the educated people; but it would be wrong to suppose that the Pāṇinian Sanskrit was a current tongue of the time. Even in the time of Patañjali many mispronounced and misaccented or corrupt words had crept into the Pāṇinian language.[6] Thus, the people, who were highly qualified in the study of Sanskrit grammar and lived in cultured and refined atmosphere, spoke good Sanskrit; but the common folk used the mixed and Prākṛitized language and their dialects had undergone much phonetical transformation. In the dramas of Harṣa we find that his characters speak the different dialects. The Sūtradhāra and the male character used the refined and correct Sanskrit. Only the Vidūsaka uses the Prākṛit language. The women of all ranks, except Sāṁkṛityāyani, used Prākṛit. She is depicted as a lady of distinction and as an authoress and who speaks Sanskrit in the Priyadarśikā. From the accounts of the pilgrim it seems quite probable that the Pāṇinian Sanskrit had an exalted status but his survey of current language is to be taken with caution and reservation. He writes, "In language, they (*Indians*) had not varied from the original source; but the people of "Mid India" are pre-eminently explicit and correct in speech; their expression being harmonious and elegant, like those of the devas, and their intonation clear and distinct, serving as rule and pattern for others."[7] This statement of Yuan Chuang is only right when we keep it in mind one major point that he came into contact with the highly educated and learned people of that time. Some of them were the men of great eminence and distinction. His

4. *Ep. Ind., IV, P.* 209.
5. *Ibid., I, P.* 68.
6. *HSL., I, P. cxxii.*
7. *Watters, I, Pp.* 152-154.

constant association with them led him to reach to the above-mentioned conclusions. His statement is correct so far as the highly literate people, who were conversant with grammar, are concerned; but as we try to mix up with the lower strata of the people, conditions were entirely different. The pilgrim, too, notes that "the people of the neighbouring territories and foreign countries "committed erros and vulgarities." To sum up the above account, we may conclude that among the educated and learned classes Sanskrit was in use both for writing and speaking; but as we take up the study of the common masses the language of a corrupt nature was in prevalence.

POPULAR LITERARY WORKS

Both Bāṇa and Yuan Chuang enable us to conclude that the Vedas were regarded as the most sacred and very highly respected works of the Hindus. They were thoroughly studied and their hymns were recited by the Brāhmaṇas.[8] Other famous works were the Rāmāyaṇa and the Mahābhārata. Whereas the Vedas were popular among the highly literate classes and especially among the Brāhmaṇas, the Rāmāyaṇa and the Mahābhārata were popular and they were read by the masses of the Hindu community with earnestness and devotion. The Purāṇas were equally respected and people attached much value to their study. Among the general works the Bṛihatakathā was the most popular. Bāṇa gives a beautiful account of the popularity of these works at more than one occasion. While giving the picturesque description of Ujjayinī Bāṇa informs us that the people of that great and glorious city were well versed in the stories of all kinds, accomplished in letters, had a keen delight in the Mahābhārata, in the Purāṇas and the Rāmāyaṇa. They were quite familiar with the Bṛihatakathā.[9] People studied these works with great devotion and earnestness and regarded it as their duty in order to gain eternal peace.

---

8. *Detailed accounts of the importance of the Vedas during the period are given while discussing the status and conduct of the Brāhmaṇas in the chapter dealing with the composition of the society.*

9. *Kādambarī, tr. Ridding, P.* 212; *KP., P.* 87.

They seem to have been interested in the stories and Kathās. Bāṇa's special mention of Bṛihatakathā indicates the taste of the people. It must have been widely read ordinarily by the educated people and its popularity can be compared with the present popularity of such works as Qissā Totāmainā, Dholāmārū, Siṁhāsana Battīsī etc. But the Rāmāyaṇa has enjoyed tremendous popularity and reverence throughout the ages. The Mahābhārata has been regarded as an encyclopaedia of learning. These great epics seems to have been included in the curricula. Chandrapīḍa was taught the study of the Rāmāyaṇa, Itihāsa, and the Mahābhārata in addition to other branches of learning including stories, dramas, romances and poems.[10] Both men and women read the Mahābhārata and the Rāmāyaṇa for the improvement of knowledge, purification of thoughts and cultivation of high ideals. Bāṇa's cousins are characteristically designated by him as the "Mahābhārata Bhavitātmanāḥ" *i.e.* "deeply conversant in the Mahābhārata."

In the Kādambarī Bāṇa writes that Chandrapīda was listening to the sweet recitations of the verses from the Mahābhārata in the vicinity of Kādambari's habitation. Vilāsavatī is said to have been listening to the epics daily before she was blessed with son. This recitation was regarded as a pious deed capable of bearing fruits. In the hermitage of Jābāli, we are told, the Rāmāyaṇa and the Mahābhārata were commonly recited. Bāṇa's several references of recitation and study of these two great epics reveal the wide popularity and reverence enjoyed by the Rāmāyaṇa and the Mahābhārata.

Many of the Purāṇas were equally important and widely read, both among the householders and the sages and saints. Most of the Pustakavāchakas and Kathāvāchakas are said to have been used to recite the passages from the Purāṇas. Bāṇa refers to one of his friends named Sudṛiṣṭi who used to read the Vāyupurāṇa daily before Bāṇa.[11]

---

10. *Ibid* : *Kād.*, P. 60.

11. *HCCTH.*, P. 72. *Pavanaproktaṁ Purāṇaṁ.*—*HCK.*, P. 39. *It literally means the Purana promulgated by Vāyu. HCK., Notes on Can. III*, P. 170; *HCESA.*, P. 52; *Harṣavardhana*, P. 382.

Other Purāṇas were also widely read by the people.[12]

Of the other works pertaining to the Kathā literature we know that the Bṛihatakathā and several other books and collections were quite popular. Ākhyāyikās were widely common and the people took much delight in reading and listening to these works. The people of the most learned and cultured city of Ujjayinī were conversant with these works on stories and the Ākhyāyikās. The Jātaka stories were equally popular among the Buddhists and we come across several examples from them when we go through the description of Divākaramitra's hermitage.

Another popular work was Subandhu's Vāsavadattā. Bāṇa speaks of it with full magniloquence. He writes in the eleventh verse of the introduction to the Harṣacharita that "the pride of the poets verily melted away through Vāsavadattā when it came to their ears."[13] Dr. Castellieri is of the opinion that Bāṇa wrote his Kādambarī especially to surpass Subandhus Vāsavadattā.[14] Mr. G. S. Chatterjee regards Subandhu as Bāṇa's contemporary.[15] We have no reason to oppose the view. The opinion expressed by Drs. Das Gupta and De that although such a possibility, as Mr. Chatterjee mentions, is not impossible, it is safer to vouch "neither for his priority nor posteriority" and that "it is scarcely possible to express a final opinion without being dogmatic."[16]

In addition to these works this period is remarkably important for the prevalent popularity of the dramas and the Kāvyas. The dramatic and poetic works of Kālidāsa were very popular. He is venerably depicted by Bāṇa who writes that the beautiful expressions uttered by Kālidāsa are like "the sprays of flowers wet with honey-sweetness."[17] It seems that at

12. *Kādambarī, tr. Ridding, Pp.* 10*ff.*

13. *HCCTH., P.* 2; *HCK., P.* 1, *Verse.* 11.

14. *Opinion quoted by Cowell and Thomas in HCCTH., P.* 2, *Note* 8; *Appendix, notes two, pp.* 67, 74, 233.

15. *G. S. Chatterjee, Harṣavardhana, P.* 285.

16. *HSL., P.* 219.

17. *HCCTH., P.* 3; *HCK., P.* 2, *Verse* 16.

this time Kālidāsa, in whom, "we are introduced at once to something new which no one hit upon before, something perfect which no one achieved and something incomparably great and enduring for all time,"[18] enjoyed universal recognition and appreciation.

Bāṇa also praises Bhāsa, who is said to have "gained as much splendour by his plays with introductions spoken by the Stage-manager (*Sūtradhāra*), full of various characters, and furnished with startling episodes, as he would have done by the erection of temples, created by architects, adorned by several stories and decorated with banners."[19] Opinions are at sharp variance with one another about the date of Bhāsa and the plays assigned to him are placed between the 5th century B.C. and 11th century A.D., the period covering about sixteen hundred years.[20] But he is referred to by Kālidāsa and Bāṇa as their distinguished predecessor and also as a dramatist of great eminence.[21] This is, however, sufficient to conclude that Bhāsa's works received an enthusiastic appreciation in the days of Harṣa.

Among the immediate successors of Kālidāsa, Bhāravi is "the earliest and the foremost" of the composers of the Mahākāvyas. We are puzzled at Bāṇa's silnece about Bhāravi, but the latter must have attained eminence much earlier than the former would have attained. His name is associated with that of Kālidāsa in the Aihole inscription of the Chālukya king Pulakeśin II.[22] This inscription is dated 634 A.D.. He must have, therefore, gained much fame by this time to be mentioned along with Kālidāsa.[23] With this epigraphic evidence at our disposal, the view that Bhāravi flourished about the close of the seventh Century A.D., seems to be of not much historical correctness.[24] His associated mention with

18. *HSL.*, *P.* 118.
19. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 3; *HCK.*, *P.* 2, *V.* 15.
20. *HSL.*, *P.* 109.
21. *Ibid.*, *P.* 101.
22. *Ep. Ind.*, *Vol. VI*, *Pp.* 3*ff.*
23. *HSL.*, *P.* 178.
24. *IHQ.*, *III*, 1927, *P.* 169.

Kālidāsa in the year 634 A.D. is enough to prove that he flourished much before Bāṇa. It is an unimpeachable fact that he lived earlier to Bāṇa and even his "contemporaneity or nearness of time" to Bāṇa is entirely wrong.[25] He definitely flourished before Bāṇa and must have gained distinction in literary circles in the age of Harṣa. Bāṇa's silence about Bhāravi's achievements, as the learned authors of the History of Sanskrit Literature term it, is "somewhat extra-ordinary."[26] Dr. Keith, however, presumes that Bāṇa's silence about Bhāravi indicates the fact that Bhāravi did not flourish much earlier and that his fame was not so great as to have compelled Bāṇa to mention his name.[27]

We cannot determine with genuine certainty the historicity of some of the writers about whom Bāṇa writes in the introductory verses of the Harṣacharita. In the twelfth verse we are informed of the prose-composition of the revered Harichandra who "stood pre-eminent as a sovereign, luminous with employment of words, and preserving rigidly the traditional rules of letters."[28] Today Harichandra is not very famous in the Sanskrit world; but he might have been one of the favourite authors during Bāṇa's times. In the next verse Sātavāhana[29] is praised for his "immortal and refined treasure of songs "which were adorned with fine expression of purest character like jewels."

The fame of Pravarasena is described as bright as lotus and which had "gone to the other shore of the ocean."[30] His "Setubandha", which is not available now, was composed in Prākṛita and he must have attained distinction and popularity during that period. Most probably, these

25. *HSL.*, *P.* 178.

26. *HSL.*, *P.* 178.

27. *Kieth, Classical Sanskrit Literature, P.* 169.

28. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 2. *Some words in the verse are used punningly. HCK.*, *P.* 2, *Verse* 12.

29. *It is also read as Śālivāhana. Both Sātavāhana and Śālivāhana are identified with King Hala of the Sātavāhana dynasty. He is said to have composed saptaśataka.*

30. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 3, *Verse.* 14.

persons are among the writers who must have been widely read and appreciated during the age of Harṣavardhana. To sum up the discussion, one might conclude that this period was remarkable for its literary taste and appreciation.

LITERATURE ON PHILOSOPHY AND RELIGION

Both Yuan Chuang and Bāṇa inform us of many works which were reveredly studied by religious-minded people. Many schools of Nyāya, Sāṅkhya, Lokāyata, Vaiśeṣika and various other systems were popular during that age and there was plentiful literature on these various systems. Yuan Chuang presents a very long list of Buddhist authors and their works. Aśvaghoṣa, Nāgārjuna, Vasubandhu, Saṅghabhadra, Guṇamati, Sthiramati and Śilabhadra and others were widely read and their works were many. Limited space and the scope of the subject do not permit us to discuss them here in details.

LITERATURE ON VARIOUS BRANCHES OF LEARNING

There were many works on various branches of learning such as Grammar, Astronomy, Āyurveda, Music, Painting, Sculpture etc.. of the other works the Nītisara of Kāmandaka was also popular. This was composed some two hundred years before the rise of Harṣavardhana, by 'Śikharaswāmī, a minister of Vikramāditya II.[31] Vātsyāyana's Kāmasūtra was also known to the people of the period under review. Subandhu was familiar with this work.[32] This is in brief the study of literature known to the people of the period as we know on the basis of our sources. We can also hold that there must have been other works which we do not come across in our sources.

---

31. *JBROS.*, 1932, *Pp.* 37-39.

32. *Chatterjee, Harṣavardhana, P.* 393. *For the date of Kāmasūtra Please see "Studies in Vātasyāyana's Kāmasūtra" by Chaklader., Pp.* 1-40.

CHAPTER XIII

EDUCATION AND LEARNING

The age of Harṣa enjoys the pre-eminent position for its educational system. We possess a great deal of informations about the progress and system of education. Bāṇa and Yuan Chuang provide us with the detailed picture of education. Both of them agree that the Brāhmaṇas were the teachers of the society.[1] They studied the Vedas very thoroughly. The pilgrim tells us that "the Brāhmaṇas learn the four Veda treatises."[2] The teacher was required to possess "a wide, thorough and minute knowledge of these with and exhaustive comprehension of all that is abstruse in them." These Brāhmaṇa teachers are highly praised for their encyclopaedic learning and zealous mission of educating the people.

RELATION BETWEEN THE TEACHER AND THE TAUGHT

From Bāṇa's desciption one point becomes quite clear that the young disciples were sent to the gurukulas where they resided with their teachers and learnt much from them. In the Harṣacharita, we are told, that the houses of Bāṇa's kinsmen were filled with hundreds of such disciples who were making the houses "resonant with the noise of continual recitation."[3] Bāṇa, too, was sent to the gurukula and by the fourteenth year he had returned from his teacher's house after having performed "all the sacred duties proper to a Brāhmaṇa as enjoined in Śruti and Smṛiti."[4]

---

1. *A detailed description has been made while dealing with the social status of the Brāhmaṇas.*

2. *Yuan Chuang's description of the four Vedas is wrong and it is clear that he knew very little about them. Watters, I, P.* 159.

3. *HCCTH., P.* 35; *HCK., Can.* 2, *P.* 21.

4. *HCCTH., P.* 32; *HCK., Can.* 1, *P.* 19.

The life of a student was brought to a close after the ceremony of Samāvartana was performed. We learn from the Harṣacharita that Bāṇa also underwent this rite of Samāvartana.[5]

The learned teachers were very sincere and earnest in their duties of teaching. Yuan Chuang informs us that the teachers "explained the general meaning (to their disciples) and taught them the minutiae; they roused them to activity and skilfully won them to progress; they instructed the inert and sharpened the dull; they doggedly persevered repeating instructions until their training was completed."[6] Although Bāṇa finished his education at the age of fourteen,[7] the studentship generally continued up to the age of twentyfive; but Yuan Chuang tells us the studentship continued up to the age of thirty.[8]

TEACHERS AS THE HIGHLY HONOURED CLASS IN THE SOCIETY

The teaching profession was highly honoured and the gurus were widely respected. The teachers were fond of the refinements of learning and they are said to be "content in seclusion." The pilgrim observes that they were not moved by honour or reproach. The rulers "treated them honourably." They paid due honour to the men of learning and the people also respected them. We are told that "the honours and praises of such men were conspicuously abundant, and the attentions private and officials paid to them were very considerable."[9] It is further told that "their way of living was simple and unostentatious. They had no fixed income. Their income consisted of offereings and gifts by students and disciples." Yuan Chuang informs us that they "got their food by begging."[10]

---

5. *Ibid., P.* 32; *HCK., Can.* 1, *P.* 19.

6. *Watters, I, P.* 160.

7. *Chandrapīḍa is said to have entered the school when he was six and studied for ten years. Thus he left the school when he was sixteen.*

8. *Watters, rs, I, P.* 160.

9. *Ibid., I, P.* 161.

10. *Ibid., I, .P.* 161.

THE DUTIES OF THE STUDENTS

The students regarded their teachers in deep reverence and honoured them like their parents and gods. In the Kādambarī we find that Śukanāsa advises prince Chandrapīḍa to pay respect to his gurus.[11] At the gurukulas the students had to undergo a great fatigue and the parents never interfered with the programme of the teachers. Queen Vilāsavatī says to his son that the latter's father was hard-hearted to send him to undergo and endure the tedious restraint of his gurus.[12] Their words were of a great importance to their students. They are said to have possessed very great power and the students obeyed them without any hesitation.[13] This was spontaneous and was for their deep knowledge and devotion to learning. It was the pious duty of a student to pay respect to their gurukulas. Bāṇa is said to have paid respect to the gurukulas where he found "wise and brilliant teachers with pure knowledge."[14] Students were always obedient to their gurus. Their honour and respect did not lessen even after the end of the studentship. Bāṇa writes about himself that he worshipped the feet of his gurus and received their good wishes before he commenced his journey.[15] Yuan Chuang, too, informs us that the first duty of the students was "to reward the kindness of their teachers."[16] Thus it is clear that complete cordial relationship existed between the teacher and the taught during the studies and after. After the students returned home after completing their course of studies they often used to go to their gurus and paid respect to them.

DAILY ROUTINE OF THE STUDENTS

We possess a detailed account of the daily life of a student. He used to get up early in the morning and, then, he had to perform his morning

11. *Kādambarī, tr. Ridding, P.* 77.
12. *Ibid., P.* 71.
13. *Ibid., P.* 77; *KP., P.* 224.
14. *HCCTH., P.* 33, *HCK., Can.* 1, *P.* 19.
15. *HCCTH., P.* 45; *HCK., Can.* 2, *P.* 26.
16. *Watters, I, P.* 160.

duties such as bath and offering the prayers. He performed various rituals and collected flowers, Kuśa-grass, Samidhā fuel and other materials for sacrifices. He was also entrursted with similar other duties of the gurukulas.

CURRICULA AND VARIOUS BRANCHES OF LEARNING

Yuan Chuang throws enough light upon the course of studies that was pursued in India during the seventh century A.D. Before a boy reached the age of seven he was to follow the "Twelve Chapters."[17] When this course was completed the childern were gradually taught the great treatises of the "Five Sciences."

Firstly, they were taught Grammar which consisted of the explanations of words and their classification.

Secondly, they were required to be well-versed in the "skilled professions and the principles of mechanical arts" including "the dual processes and astrology."

The third branch of study included "the science of medicine" and "the use of the stones and the needle."

The fourth branch of study was "the science of reasoning."

And finally the students were taught theology, "the five degrees of religious attainments" and "the doctrine of Karma."[18]

This description of the pilgrim indicates the course of studies which was carried on in the Buddhist monasteries. In the Brahmaṇical circles the Vedas were highly esteemed and formed the backbone of curricula. We have enough proof to conclude that the highest importance was attached to the study of the Vedas. Yuan Chuang, though inaccurate in his details about the Vedas, informs us that "the Brāhmaṇas learnt the four Vedas."[19] What Bāṇa says about the curricula and the main branches of learning,

---

17. *It is difficult to understand what the pilgrim exactly desires to express by the "Twelve Chapters." Most probably it refers to "the first book, a Sanskrit primer containing alphabets, which the children of India learned." Watters, I, Pp.* 154-55.

18. *Watters, I, Pp.* 154-155.

19. *Watters, I, P.* 159.

is more correct and accurate than that we find in the records of Yuan Chuang. In the Kādambarī we find the complete account of education and learning that might have been imparted to the students of the seventh century A.D.. Almost all branches of learning including all sciences[20] were taught to Chandrapīḍa who is said to have gained the highest skill in words (*pade*), sentences (*vākye*), in reasoning or logic (*pramāṇe*), in theology (*Dharmaśāstra*), in polity (*Rājanīti*), in gymnastics (*Vyāyāmavidyāṣu*), in all kinds of weapons[21] uch as the bow (*Chāpa*), chakra, shield (*charma*), scimitar (*kṛipāṇa*), dart (*śakti*), mace (*tomara*), battle-axe (*paraśu*) and club (*gadā*); in driving and elephant-riding (*gajapṛiṣṭheṣu*) and in chariot-driving (*ratha-charyāsu*); in musical instruments, such as the lute (*Vīṇā*), the lire (*veṇu*) etc.; in the laws of dancing (*nṛityaśāstreṣu*) and the science of music (*gandha-rvavedaviśeṣu*). He was trained in the management of elephants, the knowledge of horses and the marks of men[22] (*puruṣalakṣaṇa*); he was trained in the arts of painting (*chitrakarmāṇi*), leaf-cutting (*patrachchhedyo*), the use of books (*pustakavyāpāra*); he was also taught all the arts of gambling and acquired the knowledge of the cries of birds and learned astronomy (*grahagaṇite*). He gained the knowledge of testing the jewels (*ratnaparīkṣā*) and learned carpentry (*dārukarmāṇi*), the art of ivory (*dantavyāpāre*), architecture (*vāstuvidyāsu*), the science of medicine (*Āyurveda*), machanics (*yantraprayoga*), antidotes (*viṣapahāraṇa*), the science of tunnels (*Suraṅgopabheda*), swimming, magic (*indrajāla*), stories (*kathāsu*), dramas, romances (*ākhyāyikā*), poetry (*kāvyeṣu*); he thoroughly studies the *Mahābhārata*, the *Rāmāyaṇa*,

20. *These sciences include the "Twele Chapters" and all the five sciences of Yuan Chuang.*

21. *In the Harṣacharita we learn that Rājyavardhana and Harṣavardhana were trained to fight with bow and sword. HCTH. P. 118; HCK. Can. 4, P. 11.*

22. *Bāṇa informs us that the right hand of Divākaramitra was graced with all the lines and marks of a great man (puruṣalakṣaṇa). HCCTH., P. 238. Harṣa is also said to have possessed the auspicious marks which told of his sovereignty. Ibid., P. 91; Intro., P. 139. These two examples prove that a particular branch of science of the study of such marks was in the existence.*

Purāṇas and history; he learnt all kinds of writing (*lipiṣu*), and all languages of all the countries, all technicalities (*sarvasañjnāsu*), all mechanical arts (*sarvaśilpeṣu*), metre (*chhandeṣu*) and other various branches of arts.[23]

This long list is admittedly exaggerated and one man cannot attain "the highest skill" in all these branches even in the whole of his life; but this exaggerated account decidedly reveals the existence of these various branches of learning. In the Harṣacharita we are informed that Śukanāsa's son was trained in all the branches of science and arts.[24] Thus it appears that science (*vidyā*) was something different from art (*kalā*). Besides the above-mentioned branches of learning various systems of philosophy such as Nyāya, Mīmāṁsā, Vaiśeṣika etc. were also taught.

It is, however, necessary to remember that the educational institutions were not many in ancient India and there was no nationwide uniformity in the system of education. The students generally used to go to distinguished teachers who attracted them by their learning and scholarship. Thus it is quite probable that a nationwide curricula of studies could not have been introduced. The various branches of learning were taught by different teachers who specialised themselves in their respective fields. King Tārāpīḍa is said to have taken infinite pains in gathering the teachers for all branches of sciences and arts.[25]

POPULARITY OF EDUCATION

Education was widely popular during the age of Harṣa. The latter took personal interest in the spread and advancement of learning and education. Yuan Chuang informs us that "one fourth of the income from the royal land was reserved to reward high intellectual eminence."[26] Men of learning were highly esteemed by the rulers. This patronage to learning must have surely succeeded in the spread of education. From

23. *Rid* : *Kād., KP.* 60; *P., P.* 168-169.

24. *HCCTH., P.* 21; *Sarvāvidyāḥ sakalāścha kalāḥ. HCK., Can.* 1. *P.* 12.

25. *Kādambarī, tr. Ridding, Pp.* 60-61,

26. *Watters, I, P.* 176.

Bāṇa's Harṣacharita we learn that even the boys of the villages were given education and their parents took proper care to educate their children. When Bāṇa returned from the court of Harṣa, he inquired about the pursuance of the studies of the boys at the proper time.[27] This inquiry made by Bāṇa clearly shows that enough importance was attached to education even in the villages. We are further told of inquiries made by Bāṇa about the study of the Vedas "in an unbroken status" (*avichchhinno Vedābhyāsaḥ*), "the earnestness in the art of sacrifice" (*Yajñavidyākarmaṇyabhiyogaḥ*), "the classes in grammar exposition" (*Vyākaraṇe Vyākhyākhyānamaṇḍalāni*), "the logic society" (*pramāṇa goṣṭhi*), "the excessive delight in the Mīmāṁsā" (*Mīmāṁsāyāmātirasāḥ*) and "the interest in the study of Kāvyas and poetic address" (*abhinavasubhāṣita....kāvyālāpāḥ*). We are informed therein that the people were devoted to these "intellectual pastimes" with due earnestness and devotion, and they were satisfied with the progress.[28] From this conversation between Bāṇa and his kinsmen and several other references in the literature it becomes quite clear that the age of Harṣa was remarkably important for the spread and popularization of education and the high standard of learning.

GOṢṬHĪ AND MAṆḌALA

We come accross several references in Bāṇa's works pertaining to various types of goṣṭhīs and vyākhyānamaṇḍalas. Some of the inscriptions also throw light on these social institutions. They were common in ancient India and we can compare them with the study circles and public institutions of modern times which arrange expository lectures on the subject of cultural and intellectual importance and work for an advancement of civilisation and culture. In ancient India these goṣṭhīs and vyākhyānamaṇḍalas worked as the centres of intellectual supplementation and an amusement of a very high standard. Śaṅkara, the commentator of Harṣacharita defines the goṣṭhī as "a meeting place of people equal in knowledge, wealth, etiquette, intellect and age."[29] According to Vāt-

27. *HCCTH., P.* 71; *HCK., Can.* 3, *P.* 38.
28. *HCCTH., Pp.* 71-72; *HCK., Can.* 3, *Pp.* 38-39.
29. *HCK., Can.* 1, *Notes, P.* 8; *HCESA., P.* 12.

syāyana also the goṣṭhī was "a social gathering where the nāgarika found an opportunity to have a pleasant talk with the persons of the same status and position as himself by their education, intelligence, character, wealth and age."[30] At these gatherings people engaged themselves "in competitions in making verses or in various other sports of skill and arts." They afforded full and equal opportunities for the exhibition of "intellectual accomplishments and mastery of the arts."[31]

During the age of Harṣavardhana we find many kinds of the goṣṭhīs mentioned by Bāṇa. First of all, he informs us that there were Vidyāgoṣṭhīs where "discussions about the knowledge of the Blameless One (*i.e. Brahma*) were held."[32] Thus it appears that there were goṣṭhīs where discussions were held on the subjects pertaining to mataphysical and spiritual discourses. Another type of goṣṭhī was the Kāvyagoṣṭhī,[33] where discussions were held on literary topics. The next kind of goṣṭhī was the Pramāṇa goṣṭhī[34] which is supposed to be a society for discussing the art of reasoning and logic. When Bāṇa returned home from Harṣa's court, he inquired from his kinsmen and friends about the existence of an old logic society, and he was informed that it was working satisfactorily.[35] Harṣa is said to have attended many vīragoṣṭhīs which were held for the recitation of the past conflicts of the heroes.[36] Bāṇa informs us that he gained much knowledge by attending many goṣṭhīs of learned men who were deep in intellectual discussions.[37] Such goṣṭhīs assembled very often at the royal courts. This is clear from Bāṇa's humble expression that he did not possess

30. *Chaklader, Stidies in the Kāmasūtra, Pp.*164-5.

31. *Ibid., Pp.* 163-4.

32. *Cowell and Thomas wrongly translate "Niravadyavidyā" as 'the blameless discussions.' HCCTH., P.* 4. *But Mr. Kāṇe's translation is correct. HCK., Can.* 1, *Notes, P.* 18.

33. *Kādambarī, tr. Ridding, P.* 4.

34. *HCCTH., P.* 71; *HCK., Can.* 3, *P.* 38.

35. *HCCTH., P.* 72.

36. *Ibid., P.* 58; *HCK., Can.* 1, *P.* 32.

37. *HCCTH., P.* 33; *HCK., Can.* 1, *P.* 19.

the cleverness needed in the goṣṭhīs of the learned[38] which were held at Harṣa's court.

Like these goṣṭhīs there were many other Vyākhyānamaṇḍalas and Vidagdhamaṇḍalas which are mentioned very often in Bāṇa's Harṣa-charita and Kādambarī. These study circles and intellectual discourses provided people with enough food for intellectual and aesthetic nourishment; they provide us with definite and unimpeachable proofs which enable us to conclude that the intellectual standard of the people of the period under review was remarkably high and learning and education had their due place in the society.

SOME RENOWNED CENTRES OF LEARNING

We learn from the records of Yuan Chuang and I-Tsing that almost all the Buddhist monasteries were the magnificient and renowned centres of learning. We are informed by the pilgrim that in the country of Fo-ho-lo there was a great Saṁghārām where the pilgrim met Prajñākara, a man of singular wisdom and great learning. The letter taught the former the Vibhāṣā Śāstra. There were two other priests in that monastery who were well versed in the Tripiṭaka.[39] In the capital city of Kashmīr the pilgrim met many learned priests. The chief priest was a man of high moral character and was "possessed of the highest intelligence." He taught the pilgrim the "Koṣa Śāstra, the Nyāya Śāstra, Hetuvidyā Śāstra and many other Śāstras. The pilgrim informs us that all the learned men of the kingdom "flocked together to listen to the lectures of that eminent priest." He further mentions the names of six other priests of the same monastery who were noted for their great talent, and "power of clear expostion of doctrine."[40] At another monastery he studied the Śata-Śāstra from a teacher whose reasoning power was super-abundant. Here he met another teacher who was a disciple of Nāgārjuna. He expounded the doctrines of his master with clarity.[41] In the kingdom of Śrughaṇa

38. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 44.
39. *Life*, *Pp.* 50-51.
40. *Ibid.*, *Pp.* 70-71.
41. *Ibid.*, *Pp.* 74-76.

Yuan Chuang stayed for six months and studied Vibhāṣā according to the School of Sautrāntikas.[42] A great Saṁghārāma was at Matīpura where the pilgrim studied the Tattvasatya Śāstra, the Abhidharma-jnāna-prasthāna-śāstra and other Śāstras.[43] At the Bhadra-Vihāra of Kānyakubja he stayed for three months and studied Varmavibhāṣā-vyākaraṇa.[44] At Banaras (*po-lo-ni-sse*) alone there were thirty Saṁghārāmas where two thousand priests studied the teachings of Sarvāstivādin School.[45] At Hiraṇya there were two great Buddhist teachers named Tathāgatagupta and Kshāntisiṁha. With them Yuan Chuang studied the Vibhāṣā and the Nyāya-anusāra, and the other Śāstras.[46]

THE UNIVERSITY OF NĀLANDĀ

Of all the Buddhist monasteries none was so great and renowned as that of Nālandā, the greatest centre of Buddhist learning. It was "the most celebrated seat" of moral and intellectual endeavour and a radiating nucleus of Buddhist culture and thought. It was a university in the real sense of the term and it welcomed all who flocked to it from all parts of the country and the world. It provided all its inmates with full facilities in their earnest perseverance for the attainment of intellectual, moral, religious and spiritual and cosmopolitan enlightenment when Yuan Chuang visited Nālandā it was in the hey-day of its glory. He furnished us with a detailed description of this establishment and gives account of its evolution.

EARLY HISTORY OF NĀLANDĀ

We find many early references to Nālandā which prove that its historicity can be traced back to the days of Mahāvīra and Buddha;[47]

---

42. *Ibid., Pp.* 78-79.
43. *Ibid., P.* 81.
44. *Ibid., P.* 84.
45. *Ibid., P.* 98.
46. *Life., P.* 127.
47. *A. Ghosh, A Guide to Nālandā, Delhi*, 1939, *P.* 39.

but it rose to eminence during the times of the Later Guptas. We are informed by the Chinese pilgrim that the place was originally covered with mango trees and owed its name to a dragon named Nālandā.[48]

ESTABLISHMENT OF THE MONASTERIES

Yuan Chuang informs us that the remarkable beginning was made by king Śakrāditya who built the first monastery; his son and successor Budhagupta built another Saṁghārāma towards the south; his son Tathāgatagupta built a third Saṁaghārāma towards the east; the fourth monastery was added to these establishments by king Bālāditya, son and successor of Tathāgatagupta; latter's son Vajra built the fifth Saṁghārāma; and the sixth large monastery was built by a king of "Mid India."[49] All these establishments were surrounded by a lofty enclosing wall and there was one main gate which opened into the great university. The monasteries were full of grand sculptures and architecture with remarkable magnificience. The towers were richly adorned and the stages had dragon-projections and coloured caves; the massive structures and pearl-red pillars and richly adorned balustrades were finely covered and ornamented. The mango parks, the gardens with beautiful plants and flowers, and the ponds with their deep and translucent water added much to the beauty of the establishments.[50]

NĀLANDĀ UNDER HARṢA

Yuan Chuang visited the University of Nālandā when it was at the height of its glory. There he lived for five years and provides us with an elaborate picture of the great glory that was Nālandā. Such a great university was financed by many endowments and regular grants. Yuan Chuang informs us that king Harṣa had granted the revenues of about a hundred villages, and two hundred house-holders made the daily contributions of maunds of rice, butter and milk. All the "four requisities"

48. *Watters, II, P.* 164; *Life., P.* 110.
49. *Watters, II, Pp.* 164-165; *Life., Pp.* 110-111.
50. *Life., P.* 112.

were so abundantly supplied that the students found it easy to devote themselves completely to their studies without any worry for their requirements.[51]

Yuan Chuang informs us that only those "who were deeply versed in old and modern learning" succeeded in getting admission. Out of ten applicants two or three were admitted.[52] In spite of such servere test the number of students was ten thousand which speaks of the importance of the University as a great seat of learning during the period under review. To quote Dr. Tripathi, "the figure is no doubt striking" when we consider the fact that "the University was meant for advanced studies."[53]

The number of learned priests and scholars was also very great; there were one thousand teachers who could explain "twenty collections of Sūtras and Śāstras"; five hundred could explain thirty collections, and the learned priests had mastered fifty collections. To crown all the chief priest, Śīlabhadra, had studied all the Śāstras and could explain everything. The teachers were the "men of great ability and learning" and "they were looked upon as the models" all over India.[54] They followed a very strict code of conduct and engaged themselves in learning and discussion. They were "very strict in observing the precepts and regulations of the order."[55]

Almost all Śāstras were taught there. Of them, Hetuvidyā Śabdavidyā, Chikitsāvidyā, Yogaśāstra, Nyāya-anusāra-Śāstra, Prāṇya-mūla-śāstra-tīkā, Śata-Śāstra-Kośa, Vibhāṣā, Ṣaṭpadābhidharma-Śāstra etc. and other works. The Vedas are specifically mentioned by pilgrim[56] as important works taught at Nālandā.

Yuan Chuang informs us that some of the distinguished scholars were associated with the University of Nālandā, who "had kept up the lustre of the establishment and continued its guiding work." Of them

51. *Ibid., Pp.* 112-113.
52. *Watters, II, P.* 165; *Beal, II, P.* 170.
53. *THK., P.* 177.
54. *Life., P.* 112; *Watters, II, P.* 165.
55. *Ibid., P.* 165.
56. *Life, Pp.* 112, 121.

Dharmapāla, Chandrapāla, Guṇamati, Sthirmati, Prabhāmitra, Jinamitra, and Jñanachandra were noted for their "merit and learning" and they were the "authors of several treatises widely known and highly valued by contemporaries."[57] Their reputation seems beyond estimation if we take into consideration the fact that even "those who stole the name (*of Nālandā Brother*) were all treated with respect wherever they went."[58] The pilgrim was highly impressed when he met Śīlabhadra, a man of encyclopaedic learning and "whose perfect excellence was buried in obscurity."[59] He was born in the Brahminical royal family of Samataṭa. He had travelled far and wide in quest of knowledge. During his itinerancy he came to Nālandā where he met Dharmapāla who ordained him as a bhikṣu. It was here at Nālandā Śīlabhadra rose to prominence for "his profound comprehension of the principles and subtleties of Buddhism."[60]

What Yuan Chuang speaks of Nālandā is confirmed by another Chinese pilgrim I-Tsing[61] who studied at Nālandā for a considerably long period. Furthermore, the excavations at Nālandā bear true witness to the magnificence and glory that was Nālandā as a great seal of learning in the seventh century A.D..

---

57. *Watters, II, P.* 165.
58. *Ibid., II, P.* 165.
59. *Ibid., II, P.* 165.
60. *Ibid., II, P.* 109.
61. *ABRI., Pp.* 65, 154 *and* 167.

CHAPTER XIV

ART

1. ART AND ARCHITECTURE

The age of Harṣa can hardly be treated as a separate phase in the domain of art and architecture. The period under review is so closely associated with that of the Imperial Guptas that one finds it difficult to draw a line between the Gupta art and that of the age of Harṣa. Like Gupta Sovereigns Harṣa also extended his patronage to all creeds and faiths—Vaiṣṇavism and Śaivism and Jainism and Buddhism and, therefore, images and temples and monasteries related to these creeds and deities shaped the artistic activities of the period under review.

HOUSES AND HABITATIONS

Yuan Chuang, who visited the whole of India, has left a detailed acount of the houses and buildings. People lived both in cities and villages. The cities were surrounded by walls built of bricks.[1] The buildings were constructed of bricks. In some houses bamboo and wood were used to make walls. The walls were white-washed and tiles were commonly used.[2] Houses generally consisted of halls, terraces and pavilions, open for the view or to allow the breeze to pass in. The roof was made of wood. The pilgrim found similarity of styles between the houses and buildings of India and those of China. According to the pilgrim Indian houses are said to be extraordinarily high. He noticed some houses which were thatched with coarse or common grass, but bricks or boards were also added there. These houses, perhaps, belonged to the lower-middle and poorer

1. *Watters, I, P.* 147.

2. *Watters, I, P.* 147. *It is difficult to differentiate between burnt (baked) and unburnt tiles. Unbaked or unburnt tiles are totally unthinkable.*

classes. The floor of the houses was besmeared with cowdung for purification and flowers were also scattered.[3] We are further informed by the pilgrim that the people of lower castes such as "butchers, fishermen, public performers, executioners and scavengers were not allowed to live among the people of the higher castes. They were forced to live outside the cities" and towns and "their habitations were marked by a distinguishing sign."[4] Roads were narrow and shops were on the highways. Booths (*inns*) lined the roads.[5]

After describing the houses and dwellings the pilgrim refers to their furniture. We are told that the people used "corded benches." Perhaps the pilgrim means cots and beds by the "corded benches." This becomes clear on the basis of what he says further. We are told that "the royal families, the grandees, officials and the gentry adorned their benches in different ways but all had the same style (*or form*) of seat." According to him, the frames of the seats were carved in different ways and adorned with precious substances.[6]

BUDDHIST MONASTERIES

The pilgrim speaks very magniloquently when he begins his description of the Buddhist monasteries. According to him, "the monasteries had the most remarkable architecture. They had a tower at each of the four corners of the quadrangle and three high halls in a tier. The rafters and roofbeams were carved with strange figures and the doors, windows, and walls were painted in various colours." "The inner rooms and the central hall varied in their dimensions" and there was no particularly prescribed way for the construction of the tiers of the terraces of the rooms.

---

3. *Ibid., Vol. I, P.* 147. *Bāṇa also refers to the use of cowdung at several places.*

4. *Watters, I, P.* 147.

5. *Ibid., I, P.* 147.

6. *Ibid., Pp.* 147-148. *Bāṇa gives a beautiful description of the bed especially decorated for the honey-moon chamber* (*Vāsagṛiha*). *HCCTH., Pp.* 131-132.

Their "doors opened to the east,"[7] and the throne also faced the east.[8] It is strange to note that the pilgrim is silent about the temples whose number was perhaps larger than that of the monasteries.[9] We find some account of the temples here and there. They were multi-storeyed and their terraces and caves were of carved and designed stone and ornamented wood.[10]

2. PAINTING

The various references to painting in the literature of the period under review make it clear that the age of Harṣa was remarkably characterised by a great enthusiasm for this branch of art. The mention of picture-galleries (*Chitraśālās or Chitrasālikās*)[11] and the palaces and buildings with beautiful paintings reveal the refined characteristics of the people. From Bāṇa's description of the city of Ujjayinī it is evident that the people of all classes possessed a really very high sense of art. We are told that the city was full of painted halls filled with the pictures of gods, demons, siddhas, Gandharvas, Vidyādharas, snakes etc.. These picture-halls appeared like a row of heavenly chariots came down from the sky to behold fair ladies of Ujjayini.[12] At another occasion Bāṇa mentions that picutre-houses were adorned by paintings of leaves and birds of various kinds.[13]

At auspicious occasions painters were engaged to work on the walls. Bāṇa informs us that the pregnant queen of king Tārāpīḍa spent

---

7. *Even to this day the houses opening to the east are preferred to those facing the west.*

8. *Watters, Vol. I, P.* 147.

9. *In the course of his accounts the pilgrim mentions the number of temples along with that of the monasteries. The total number of the temples must be higher to that of the Buddhist monasteries. But nothing can be said definitely and conclusively as the pilgrim has definitely some favour for Buddhist monasteries and other Buddhist establishments.*

10. *Watters, Vol. I, P.* 147.

11. *Kādambarī, tr. Ridding, P.* 210; *Ratnā., Pp.* 199-229.

12. *Kādambarī, tr. Ridding, P.* 210.

13. *KP., P.* 241.

her time in a palace plastered with white colour and attracted the heat by the wealth of auspicious pictures painted fresh on the walls.[14] The marriage of Rājyaśrī was another occasion when the artists and painters decorated the walls of the royal palace.

The most popular picture among the men and women of the refined society was of Kāmadeva. In the beautifully decorated Vāsagṛiha the pictures of Kāmadeva and his two wives named Prīti and Rati, were fixed.[15] Kādambarī's bed-room also possessed the picture of Kāmadeva. She gave her last instructions to Mahāśvetā to destroy that picture.[16]

In the Harṣacharita we are informed that the pictures of the Chāmaragrāhiṇīs and defeated princesses were also portrayed. The articles such as Vartikā, picture-board and a brush are also mentioned at various places. Some primary and mixed colours are also mentioned which are said to have been used by the painters of the period under review.

Among Bāṇa's friend there was one skilled painter named Vīravarman.[17] From these references it becomes quite clear that professional painting was a very popular branch of art and that it was especially liked by the women of that age.

3. MUSIC

It can be safely said that whatever one's views on life and whatever one's beliefs and faith, no one can deny the great influence that music had on the cultural development of human society for its highest graces from the feelings of the heart. Even today, with a pragmatic view of life, it is totally impossible to ignore the importance of several achievements and accomplishments in the sphere of music that man has attained since the very dawn of human civilization.

So far as the people of India are concerned, music is deep-rooted in life itself. Our traditions, myths and legends and almost all aspects of

---

14. *KP., P.* 126.
15. *HCCTH., Pp.* 124, 130.
16. *Kādambarī, tr. Ridding, P.* 194.
17. *HCCTH., P.* 33; *HCK., Can.* 1, *P.*19.

our life are finally reflected in the music and the people of this land have enjoyed throughout the ages the great charm of music. It gives us aesthetical, emotional and spiritual satisfaction.

During the age of Harṣa music was regarded as one of the major branches of the fine arts. Almost all women of the higher ranks are represented to have been trained in music,[18] and the people took much delight in it. At the royal palaces it was the chief source of entertainment and amusement. We are informed in the Kādambarī that a band of distinguished female musicians was sent to entertain Chandrapīḍa at the royal guest house. Among them a lute-player (*Viṇāvādinī*), players on flute (*Veṇuvādyanipuṇāḥ*), singers (*Gītakalākuśalāḥ*), skilful Krīḍarāginī (?), experts in aṣṭapada (?), and reciters of the verses (*Subhāṣitapāṭhikāḥ*) are specifically mentioned.[19]

Among all musical instruments lute was very common among ladies.[20] Mahāśvetā was found by Chandrapīḍa at the temple of Śiva playing on the lute. In her last message Kādambarī asks Mahāśvetā that the latter must lovingly keep her lute in her own lap.[21] Likewise, Yaśomatī asks the chamberlain to fetch her favourite lute so that she may embrace it before plunging into fire.[22] In the Priyadarśikā Kāñchanamālā is represented with a lute in her hand.[23] Malayavatī is said to have been well-versed in the art of lute-playing.

At the palaces music was commonly patronized and the daily routine of the kings and princes was inaugurated with the sound of musical instruments. Various celebrations were unthinkable without music.[24] In the Priyadarśikā we find that there was a grand music-hall (*Gandhar-*

---

18. *We have already referred to it while dealing with female education.*
19. *Rid.* : *Kād.*, *P.* 152; *KP.*, *P.* 406.
20. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 83.
21. *Rid.* : *Kād.*, *P.* 195; *KP.*, *P.* 625.
22. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 150; *HCK.*, *Can.* 5, *P.* 28.
23. *Priya.*, *Act.* *III*, *P.* 50.
24. *Ratnā.*, *Act.* *I*, *P.* 31; *HCCTH.*, *P.* 123; *Priya.*, *P.* 50.

śālā) at the palace of Udayana.[25] In the Harṣacharita Saṅgītagṛiha is mentioned at Sthāṇvīśvara.[26]

Men, too, are represented to have been interested in music. Among the companions of Bāṇa, there were two singers (*gāyanau*) named Somila and Grahāditya, two pipers (*Vāṅśikau*) named Madhukara and Pārāvata, a drummer (*Mārdaṅgikaḥ*) named Jīmūta and a music teacher named Dārduraka.[27] Kādambarī's special representative Keyūraka is depicted as a noted lute-player (*Vīṇāvādaka*).[28] The people in general, too, are represented to have taken interest in music. Bāṇa informs us that the city of Sthāṇvīśvara was a music-hall for aspirant musicians and a city of Gandharva for singers.[29]

4. DANCE

Like music, dance, too, mirrors the cultural heritage of a nation. This fact is axiomatically true with India's culture and civilization. The performances of dancing women with embroidered garments and open bosoms are described even in the Ṛigveda. Men dancers are also depicted therein who are said to have performed the various kinds of dances with their limbs adorned with golden ornaments.[30] We find the same importance of dance even today.

During the age of Harṣa we find a number of references to dancers. Both men and women are depicted as dancers in the works of Bāṇa and Harṣa's dramas. Among the companions of Bāṇa there was one dancing girl (*nartakī*) named Hariṇikā. We are also told about one male dancer (*lāsakayuvā*) named Tāṇḍavika.[31] When Bāṇa met Harṣa at his royal camp near Maṇitārā he found a number of dancing women (*Vāravilāsinīḥ*).

---

25. *Priya.*, *P.* 50.
26. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 55.
27. *Ibid.*, *P.* 33; *HCK.*, *Can.* 1, *P.* 19.
28. *Rid* : *Kād.*, *P.* 142.
29. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 82; *HCK.*, *Can.* 3, *Pp.* 43-44.
30. *Age of Mantras*, *P.* 58.
31. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 33; *HCK.*, *Can.* 1, *P.* 19.

Their "foreheads were blackened by the darkness produced through the ornamental tilaka of black agallochum being melted by the drops of perspiration produced by their repeated prostrations" in dance; they were adorned with many ornaments and fine dresses; the movement of their eyebrows, the 'motion' of their jar-like bosoms and their outstretched arms attracted Bāṇa who gives a picturesque description of their performances. Therein we find a vivid picture of "the side-long glances of their eyes, the 'rapid bendings of their limbs and their expression of emotions."[32] Bāṇa informs us that there were many dancing girls[33] among prisoners-of-war who were made captives by Bhaṇḍī after Rājyavardhana's conquest over the king of Mālvā.[34] From these two references it becomes quite clear that the dancing girls were generally employed at palaces and courts and that they were perfectly trained in the art of dance. Girls of higher classes were also trained in the art of dance. It was an essential part of education that was given to girls of that age. Rājyaśrī, Kādambarī and Priyadarśikā are said to have been trained in the art of dancing.

5. DRAMA AND STAGE

The stage formed one of the main entertainments during the age of Harṣa. All the three dramas of Harṣa were staged before the imperial audience and many distinguished visitors, guests and feudatories were invited on that occasion. Many citizens and people eager to witness the grand performance had flocked to the capital They are all addressed by the stage-manager in the very beginning. The Janapada of Sthāṇviśvara was looked upon as a concert-hall by the actors (*lāsakaiḥ*).[35] These references to actors are definite proofs of dramatic performance. One of the companions of Bāṇa was a young actor (*Śailāliyuvā*) named Śikhaṇḍaka.[36]

---

32. *HCCTH., Pp.* 61-62; *HCK., Can.* 2, *Pp.* 34-35.

33. *Cowell and Thomas term 'Vāravilāsiniḥ' as 'beauteous women' but I have adapted the term "dancing girls" as Dr. Kane has done. HCCTH., P.* 225; *HCK., Can.* 7, *Notes. P.* 209.

34. *HCCTH., P.* 225 ; *HCK., Can.* 7, *P.* 67.

35. *HCCTH., P.* 82; *HCK., P.* 43.

36. *HCCTH., P.* 33; *HCK., P.* 19.

Women were also interested in the art of drama. At the courts a stage-manager was employed. This job was also entrusted to a lady. We meet Muktikā, the manager of the drama, who was crying aloud near Rājyaśrī in the Vindhya forest.[37] It appears that the lady was intimately associated with the princess.

37. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 248. ; *HCK.*, *Can.* 8, *P.* 80.

CHAPTER XV

ECONOMIC LIFE

The most valuable description of India's prosperity and wealth by Yuan Chuang combined with that of Bāṇa and the epigraphic and numismatic evidences give us a detailed account of economic life of the people during the seventh century A.D.. With the dawn of this epoch-making century a new era of peace and order was inaugurated by Harṣa after the political anarchy that existed for more than one hundred years. By the political reunification of almost the whole of Northern India after disintegration following the downfall of the Imperial Guptas, Harṣa inferred an inestimable boon upon the people. Under his strong and well-organized administration we find a remarkable growth and development of agriculture, industry, trade and commerce. In the pages to follow an attempt is made to survey the progress made in these fields.

AGRICULTURE

Agriculture is rightly said to have been one of the chief means of livelihood of the bulk of the people throughout the ages. It has contributed considerably to the economic prosperity and richness of India. Yuan Chuang gives us the minutest details of agricultural and natural products of various parts of India. He says, "As the districts vary in their natural qualities they differ also in their natural products."[1] At Lampa the country produced "upland rice" and sugar-cane and it had much wood and little fruit.[2] At Nagar, grain and fruits were produced in abundance and the country of Gāndhāra was famous for its "luxuriant crops of cereals and a profusion of fruits and flowers." There, we are told, much sugar-cane and sugar-candy was produced.[3] Kashmir was famous for its saffron and

1. *Watters.*, *I*, *P.* 177.
2. *Ibid.*, *I*, *P.* 181.
3. *Ibid.*, *I*, *Pp.* 183, 199.

abundant fruits and flowers. The soil of Takshaśilā and Siṁhapura was fertile and produced good crops, with flowing streams and luxuriant vegetation.[4]

After visiting the north-west region the pilgrim comes to the Indo-Gangetic plain and describes the agricultural products of the region.

The people of Jālandhara produced rice and other grain and fruits and flowers were in abundance.[5] Around Mathurā the soil was very fertile and the agriculture was the chief business. This region also produced a fine stripped cotton.[6] The soil of Sthāṇīśvara and Śrughna was rich and fertile and the crops were abundant; but "the majority pursued trade and few were given the farming."[7]

The soil of Matīpur and Goviśana yielded grain, fruits and flowers. The country of Ahichchhatrā was mainly an agricultural one. The pilgrim, while describing about Kānyakubja, tells us that "the inhabitants were well off and there were families with great wealth; fruit and flowers were abundant and sowing and reaping had their seasons."[8] The country of Ayodhyā "yielded good crops" and fruits and flowers were in abundance.[10] The land about Prayāga and Kauśāmbī was also very fertile and the main occupation of the people was cultivation. We do not find detailed description of crops that were produced at Prayāga; but the land about Kauśāmbī "yielded much upland rice and sugar-cane." As the pilgrim marched further "the grain crops of the country were very plentiful" and "fruits and flowers were abounded."[11] The regions between Śrāvastī and Kuśīnārā were also very fertile and had good crops. The soil of Kāpilavastu was "fertile and farming operations were regular." From the des-

---

4. *Ibid.*, *I*, *Pp.* 240, 248.
5. *Ibid.*, *I*, *P.* 196.
6. *Ibid.*, *I*, *P.* 301.
7. *Ibid.*, *I*, *Pp.* 314, 318.
8. *Watters*, *I*, *Pp.* 322, 330.
9. *Ibid.*, *I*, *P.* 340.
10. *Ibid.*, *I*, *P.* 355.
11. *Ibid.*, *I*, *Pp.* 366, 373.

cription of the pilgrim it seems that the country of Kapilavastu was not very prosperous. We are informed that in such a small country more than ten cities were utterly deserted and ruined. The pilgrim records that the people of Vārāṇasī had boundless wealth. There "the harvests were abundant; fruits and other trees grew densely and there was a luxuriant vegetation."[12] The country of Magadha was also rich in soil and yielded "luxuriant crops." The pilgrim informs us that "a kind of rice with large grain of extraordinary savour and fragrace called by the people 'the rice for grandees,' was produced at Magadha."[13] In Bengāl (*Puṇḍravardhana, Karṇasuvarṇa etc.*) the land was moist and "crops were abundant; the Jack-fruit was plentiful"; the population was dense and the "farming operations were regular."[14] The country of Kāmarūpa was also "low and moist" and the "crops were regular." The famous products were the Jake-fruit and Cocoa. These products were abundant and people took much interest in their farming.[15]

In his general survey the pilgrim recollects that the fruits of the āmra (*mango*), the āmla (*tamarind*), the Madhūk (*Bassia latifolia*), the badara (*jujube*), the Kapittha (*wood-apple*), the āmala (*myrobalan*), the tinduka (*diospyros*), the udumbara (*Ficus glomerata*), the mocha (*plantain*), the nārikela (*cocoanut*) and the panasa (*Jack-fruit*) were produced in various parts of India. He summarises his description of fruits with the following words : "It is impossible to enumerate all the kinds of fruits and one can only mention in a summary way those which are held in esteem among the inhaibitants."[16] Some of the common fruits were pears, plums, peaches, apricots and grapes which were planted "here and there"; but pomegranates and sweet oranges were grown in all the parts of the country.[17]

So far as the farming was concerned the people prepared the soil

---

12. *Watters, II, P.* 47.
13. *Ibid., II, P.* 86.
14. *Ibid., II, Pp.* 184, 191.
15. *Ibid., II, P.* 185.
16. *Watters, I, P.* 177.
17. *Ibid., I, Pp.* 177-8.

well. Sowing, planting and reaping were carried on their seasons according to the industry. From the survey of the Chinese visitor it seems that all the cultivators were not hard-working and alert. Some were lazy and legged behind in their profession.[18] The main agricultural products were rice, wheat, ginger, mustard, melons, pumpkins and kunda.

This is "a long but admittedly incomplete list of principal food-grains and fruits."[19] But from this description of the pilgrim it is almost definite that the whole of Northern India was fully cultivated and was very prosperous with its agricultural and natural products. The entire tract of the Gaṅgā Valley and the Gaṅgā-Brahmaputrā delta were great fertile areas.

Like Yuan Chuang, Bāṇa also gives a detailed description of "the excellences of the good soil," of the Śrīkaṇṭha Janapada of which Sthāṇiśvara was a part. There were "the unbroken lines of Puṇḍra sugar-cane" and its "marches were packed with corn heaps." The entire land is said to have been adorned with rice crops "extending beyond their fields" and the wheat crops were abounded.[20] Bāṇa's accounts also include the graphic description of pot-herbs, plantains, vine-arbours, pomegranate, orchards, arbours, Pīlu sprays, citron leaves and saffron filaments. Strangely enough, Bāṇa also mentions that "the woodrangers tasted the cocoa-nut juice" and that the travelling folk plundered the date-trees.[21] These days the products of the north, generally speaking, do not include the cocoanuts and the date-trees; but it is quite likely that the people of Sthaṇaiśvara might have grown cocoanuts and date-trees during the period under review.

From Bāṇa's description it appears that the people were also familiar with the advanced technique of irrigation system. He informs us that the farms were "watered by the pots of the Persian Wheel."[22]

---

18. *Ibid.*, *I*, *P.* 178.
19. *CA.*, *P.* 858.
20. *HCCTH.*, *Pp.* 79-80; *HCK.*, *Can.* 3, *P.*42.
21. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 80; *HCK.*, *Can.* 3, *P.* 42.
22. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 79; *CA.*, *P.* 586.

OWNERSHIP OF LAND AND PROPERTY

From the grants of Harṣa it appears almost certain that the ultimate owner of the land was the sovereign who could grant the land or the whole village to any one he liked. The farmers were his tenants and paid one sixth of the produce as rent.[23] The complete ownership of the land or the village was enjoyed on the strength of a royal grant (*Śāsana*) by any individual. Sometimes people also tried to enjoy such ownership of the strength of some forged Śāsanas. Dr. Būhler points out that such forgeries existed during the age of Harṣa.[24] The village of Soma Kuṇḍikā had formely been enjoyed on the strength of such a forged document by one Vāmarathya from whom it was taken after destroying the old plate.[25] But there is nothing unusual or uncommon if we find such an example during the period under review. Today there is hardly any village in India where we do not find quarrels for land. That the forged ownership was detected by the Government and the guilty was brought to books and the land was alloted to the real owner speaks of Harṣa's efficient system of administration. When a tract of land or a village was donated to some one the entire revenue was given to the donee.

Thus we find that the ultimate ownership of the land was vested with the sovereign, the latter also owned the royal land. It was divided into four divisions; the income from one part was used for the "expenses of Government"; one for the "endowment of great public servants", the third part was reserved for rewarding "high intellectual eminence" and the rest was distributed to the various sects for gaining "religious merit."[26]

REVENUE AND TAXATION

The tenants, we are told, were required to pay the one sixth of the produce to the king or to the person to whom the land was donated. As the taxation was not heavy, the people kept to their hereditary occupation

---

23. *Watters, I, P.* 176.
24. *Ep. Ind., Vol. I, P.* 71.
25. *Ibid., P.* 71.
26. *Watters, I, P.* 176.

and attended to their patrimony. Light duties were imposed upon the tradesmen which were exacted at ferries and barrier stations.[27]

DEVELOPMENT OF VARIOUS INDUSTRIES

Although India was primarily an agricultural country, the industry was not legging behind. Both Yuan Chuang and Bāṇa supply us with full information regarding the industrial development during the age of Harṣa. From the references to the different varieties of clothes,[28] it is evident the textile industry was exceedingly advanced in the seventh century A.D..

The evidence at our disposal proves that the Metal Industry was also highly advanced during the period under review. Some of the household utensils were made of brass and copper.[29] All the implements of war such as spear, shield, sword, sabre, arrow, coat-of-mail etc. were made of iron.[30] Bāṇa also informs us that the swords were so finely polished that they could also be utilised as mirrors. Queen Yaśomatī is said to have seen her face in the sword's blade.[31] At Vārāṇasī the pilgrim saw "a t'u-shi (bell-metal ?)" image of the Deva[32] "nearly hundred feet high" and "which was life-like in its awe-inspiring majesty."[33] At Nālandā he noticed another copper image of the Buddha more than 80 feet high.[34] Several fine and artistic works of metals, especially of gold and silver were

27. *Watters, I, P.* 176.

28. *A detailed description of various clothes and dresses has already been made while dealing with the dress and ornaments in chapter on society in the present thesis.*

29. *Watters, I, P.* 178.

30. *Ibid., I, P.* 171.

31. *HCCTH., P.* 109.

32. *Yuan Chuang does not mention clearly the name of the Deva whose image he saw at Vārāṇasī. According to Watters remark, it was the Lingam of Śiva. Watters, II, P.* 47.

33. *Ibid., II, P.* 47.

34. *Ibid., II, P.* 171.

also made for decoration and presentation. We are informed by Bāṇa that at the time of marriage ceremony of Rājyaśrī, a number of gold-workers had been engaged in hammering gold[35] which was used for making works of art. Other industries also appear to have been flourished during the period under review. At the time of Rājyaśrī's marriage several artists were invited who included among themselves the carpenters, leather-workers, designers, modellers, ivory-workers, painters, dyers etc.. They are separately described to have been busy in their respective jobs.[36]

The long list of different articles which were sent by Bhāskaravarman, the king of Assam, throws enough light on various industries. Among these articles were the famous ornaments, bright gold-leaves, pillows of Samūruka leather, cane stools, thick bamboo tubes containing mango sap and oil, bundles of woven silk, Gośīrṣa sandal, camphor, carved boxes of panels for painting, gold-painted bamboo cages, and rings of hippopotamous ivory.[37]

The art of gem-cutting and jewellery was also hightly developed. Among the companions of Bāṇa, there was one hairikaḥ who was expert in gemmology. Different kinds of jewels are mentioned in Bāṇa's works and the records of the pilgrim. They were used in making ornaments, and in decorating the thrones, beds, mirrors, and even the elephants were decked with pearls.[38] Bāṇa informs us in the Kādambarī that Chandrapīḍa was taught the science of examining gems, pearls and other precious stones.[39]

COMMERCE AND TRADE

From the development of various industries it can be easily inferred that trade and commerce must have been in the flourishing conditions. Moreover, we have the definite proofs that the trade in the seventh century

---

35. *HCCTH.*, *P.* 124.
36. *Ibid.*, *Pp.* 123-125.
37. *HCCTH.*, *Pp.* 213-15.
38. *Ibid.*, *P.* 215.
39. *Rid* : *Kād.*, *P.* 60, *Ratnaparikṣā is also mentioned in Vātsyāyana's Kāmasūtra and Bṛihat-Saṁhitā. quoted in CA.*, *P.* 588.

A.D. was in highly advanced condition. Yuan Chuang throws sufficient light upon the progress of India's trade and commerce. He informs us that the "tradesmen went to and fro bartering their merchandize." The government also encouraged trade by levying "light duties" which were paid by the tradesmen at different "ferries and barrier stations."[40] While giving a few particulars about the division of the people of India, he describes that the third order was "class of traders" (*Vaiśyas*) who "bartered commodities and pursued gain far and near."[41]

From some of his indirect references, too, we find further support to our conclusion. He writes that rare and precious substances of various kinds were bartered for merchandize from the sea-ports.[42] The majority of the people of Sthāṇviśvara "pursued trade" and "varieties from other lands were collected in this country."[43] He is corroborated by Bāṇa who also informs us that Sthāṇviśvara was "the land of the philosopher's stone for the seekers of wealth" and it was "the land of profit for the merchants."[44] The capital city of Kānyakubja was also famous for its rarities which were collected from strange lands.[45] The people of Ayodhyā are said to have been devoted to "parctical learning" which indicates their craftsmanship.[46] At Vārāṇasī the people "had boundless wealth" and their houses were full of rare valuables."[47] All these evidences throw light upon the progress of trade and commerce.

COMMERCIAL RELATIONS WITH FOREIGN COUNTRIES

The testimony of Yuan Chuang and Bāṇa proves that international trade was carried on with China, Ceylon, Persia and other countries. Yuan

40. *Watters, I, P.* 176.
41. *Ibid., I, P.* 168.
42. *Ibid., I, P.* 178.
43. *Ibid., I, P.* 315.
44. *HCCTH., P.* 82. *HCK., Can.* 3, *Pp.* 43-4.
45. *Watters, I, P.* 314.
46. *Ibid., I, P.* 365.
47. *Ibid., II, P.* 47.

Chuang informs us that the city of Charitapura (*Che-li-ta-lo*) was "a thoroughfare and resting place for sea-going traders and strangers from distant lands."[48] The post of Tāmralipti was also a noted centre of sea-trade[49] and the inhabitants of Sūrat utilized the sea and they were traders by profession.[50] Bāṇa informs us that the land of Śrīkaṇṭha Janapada was irrigated by the pots of the Persian wheel.[51] In the Kādambarī we are informed that the famous horse Indrāyudha was sent by the monarch of Persia.[52] In the cavalry of Harṣa Bāṇa saw the horses from Persia along with those of Vanāyu, Kamboja, Āraṭṭa, Bhāradwāja and Sindha. In the Harṣacharita and Kādambarī he tells us at more than one occasion that China silk (*Chīnāṅśuka*) was very famous during the age of Harṣa.[53]

From these evidences it can be safely concluded that the international trade was in floursing conditions and that it was conducted mainly through the sea. India's maritime activities extended in the eastern waters as far as China and Japan.[54] Mr. Kakasu Okakura informs us that "down to the days of the Mohammedan conquest the intrepid mariners of Bengāl coast" founded their colonies in Ceylon, Jāvā and Sumātrā and Cathay (*China*), and there was "mutual intercourse."[55] Our maritime activity was also "equally manifest towards the West." We are told that the ships of India and China "could be seen constantly" at Hira on the Euphrates as early as the fifth (?) century A.D.[56] There seems to be a constant traffic accross the sea between India and China in the seventh century A.D.[57] Various representations of ships and boats in the Ajantā paintings

48. *Ibid., II, P.* 194.
49. *Ibid., II, P.* 190.
50. *Ibid., II, P.* 248.
51. *HCCTH., P.* 79.
52. *Rid. : Kād., P.* 62.
53. *HCCTH., Pp.* 28. *ff.*
54. *Mukherji, Indian Shipping, Calcutta,* 1912, *P.* 163.
55. *Ideals of the East, Pp.* 1, 2. *quoted in Ind. Ship., P.* 163.
56. *Tule's Cathay, I, Lxxiii. quoted in Ind. Ship., P.* 168.
57. *Ind. Ship., Pp.* 170-72; *also quoted therein, Beal, II, P.* 169; *JRAS.,* 1896, *P.* 490.

are "rightly interpreted" by Griffiths as only a vivid testimony to the ancient foreign trade of India.[58]

MEDIA OF EXCHANGE

Although the rare and precious commodities of various kinds were "bartered for merchandize, the trade and commerece of the country was conducted through definite media of exchange,"[59] The pilgrim informs us that gold and silver coins, cowries and small pearls were the media of exchange.[60] In Nepāl copper coins were the medium of exchange.[61]

COINAGE UNDER HARṢA

Dr. John Allan, writing in 1914, opined that "the right of coinage has never been the jealously exercised symbol of sovereignty among Hindus that it was amongst Muhammadans."[62] He continues further, "some of the greatest of Hindu sovereigns, *e.g.* Harṣavardhana, do not appear to have struck coins at all."[63] At the very outset we must say that Allan was wrong. It is unthinkable that Harṣa, the emperor ruling over almost whole of Northern India, could have ruled for more than four decades without issuing coins.

The Chinese pilgrim who visited India for nearly fifteen years, and who writes his accounts on the basis of his personal and on-the-spot study, says "in the commerce of the country gold and silver coins, cowries, and small pearls are the media of exchange."[64] This description makes it abundantly clear that Harṣa's regime was not without coins.

It can be argued that Harṣa did not issue his own coins and allowed

---

58. *Quoted in Ind. Ship.*, *P.* 41.

59. *Watters*, *I*, *P.* 178.

60. *Ibid.*, *I*, *P.* 178.

61. *Ibid.*, *II*, *P.* 83.

62. *Catalogue of the Coins of the Gupta Dynasties and of Śaśāṅka, king of Gauḍa, London*, 1914, *Intro.*, *P. LXVIII*; *Mukeherji*, *Harṣa*, *Pp.* 115*ff.*

63. *Ibid.*, *P. LXVIII.*

64. *Watters*, *I*, *P.* 178.

the use of the coins of his predecessors and those of his brother-in-law, Grahavarman and his predecessors. But this can only be accepted in case of a ruler ruling for a short period and over a small kingdom. Harṣa, as we know, ruled for more than forty years and his frontiers covered the land from Kashmīra to Narmadā and from Gujrāt-Kāthiawār to Kāmarūpa. His times also saw the tremendous growth of trade and commerce and no one can believe that it could be possible for Harṣa to rule over it without the use of coins, a definite and standard medium of exchange.

It also appears that an aritcle on "Some Coins of the Maukharīs and the Thāneśvara Line" by R. Burn[65] did not receive Allan's attention. This is clear from the fact that Burn's article appeared in 1906 whereas Allan published his book in 1914. Had he seen Burn's article he must have referred to it and, would not have made such an outright remark that Harṣa did not issue the coins.

These coins were found in 1904 by a labour at Bhitaura in Amsin Paragana of Faizābād District. They include one gold, 522 silver and eight copper coins. According to Burn one of these coins may be attributed to Harśa (*not Harṣa*), 9 to Pratāpaśīla (*king Prabhākaravardhana*), and 284 to Śīlāditya (*Harṣa*). Of the remaining coins 9 are attributed to Iśānavarman, 6 to Sarvavarman, and 19 to Avantivarman. The scholars did not agree with Burn and the view of the latter was challenged by some of them. Hoernle tells us that "the correct attribution of these coins is not so simple as it may appear at first sight."[66] Referring to Burn's readings he says, "Mr. Burn is disposed to attribute them to Harṣavardhana. To myself that attribution is very doubtful. The title Śīlāditya was not uncommonly assumed by, or given to rulers of that period. Hiuen Tsang gives the title principally to Harṣavardhana, but he mentions other rulers also, who also bore it."[67]

In view of these conflicting views I discussed this problem with Dr. J. N. Banerjee, formerly Carmichael Professor of Ancient Indian

---

65. *JRAS.*, 1906, *Pp.* 843*ff.*
66. *Ibid.*, 1909, *P.* 446.
67. *Ibid.*, 1909, *P.* 446.

History and Culture, Calcutta University. The learned scholar supported the theory put forward by Mr. Burn. Dr. Banerjee told me that in support of Mr. Burn's contention it may be said that the coins are attributed to the Maukharis and the Puṣpabhūtis and that the Maukharīs were closely related to the Thāneśvara king Harṣa, being brother-in-law to Grahavarman. It is well-known that after the assassination of Grahavarman the sovereignty passed from the Maukharīs to the Thāneśvara king. It is, therefore, possible that "Pratāpaśīla" and "Śīlāditya" coins were struck by Harṣa. But it seems better to adopt Mr. Burn's attribution to Prabhākarvardhana and Harṣa. The cresent which appears on all these coins, accordingly to Dr. Banerjee, seems to have been derived from the coins of the white Hūṇas who copied it from the Sassanian series.[68] Prof. Bajpai opines the Silver coins of Harṣa are of "Madhyadeśa type of the Gupta silver coinage."[69] The learned professor has also drawn our attention to one gold coin of Harṣa acquired by him from Farukhabad in Uttar Pradesh.

Prof. Bajpai read the Brāhmī legend on the obverse of the coin as follows :

Parama bha
ṭṭāraka Mahārā
Jādhirāja Parame-
śvara Śrī Mahārā
(ja Ha) rṣdeva

Prof. Bajpai rightly "attributes this gold coin to Harṣa", the son and successor of King Prābhakaravardhana of the Puśpabhūti dynasty of Thānésvara and Kanauj.[70] The learned scholar has maintained that the titles assumed by Harṣa in his coin are "compared with those assumed by him and known to us from his records and his seals."[71] He also affirms

68. *Hoernle, however, suggests "a possible connection of the still unexplained 'Aulikara crest of Yaśodharman with curious cresent-like object on these coins." JRAS.*, 1909, *P.* 448.

69. *JNSI., Vol. XXVI, Pt. ii.*

70. *Ibid.*

71. *Ibid.*

that "the characters of the Brāhmī legend on the coin leaves no doubt as to its date. They are similar to the Brāhmī characters of the Madhuban and Banskhera records of Harṣa."

Thus we can, quite safely, conclude that Harṣa issued his own coins and they must have formed a standardised medium of exchange.

GROWTH OF CITY-LIFE

Thus enormous growth of industries and trade naturally led to a tremendous growth of city-life.[72] There were many cities which "were the centres of prosperity."[73] The "prosperity and importance of Kanauj grew tremendously under Harṣa and it became "the premier city of Northern India supplanting Pāṭaliputra."[74] It was "very strongly defended" and had "lofty structures everywhere". The city was full of many beautiful parks and gardens and tanks of clear water.[75] People of Kanauj were very fond of rarities which were collected from different countries. They were well-to-do and there were "families with great wealth."[76] Bāṇa also gives the glimpses of the immense wealth and grandeur of city-life while giving the description of Ujjayinī.[77] Though the picture of this great city, as drawn by Bāṇa is fantastically exaggreated, it indicates the wealth and prosperity that was accumulated in the big cities. Takṣaśilā, Jālandhara, Mathurā, Sthāṇviśvara, Matīpura, Mayūra, Ahichchhatrā, Kapitha, Ayodhyā and Kauśāmbī were some of the famous and prosperous cities of Northern India. Prayāga and Vārāṇasī are highly praised by the pilgrim for their wealth and prosperity. They were densely populated and "had boundless wealth" and possessed "rare valuables."[78]

But on the other hand some of the famous and great Buddhist centres

72. *S. K. Das, Economic History of Ancient India, Calcutta,* 1925, *P.* 273.
73. *Mukherji, Harṣa, P.* 165.
74. *THK., P.* 147.
75. *Watters, I, P.* 340.
76. *Ibid., I,* 340.
77. *Rid. : Kād., Pp.* 47-48.
78. *Watters, II, Pp.* 46-47.

were losing their importance. Śrāvastī, Kapilvastu and Vaiśālī, which once had been very famous centres of Buddhism were in ruined conditon. In the province of Kapilvastu there were more than ten deserted cities "all in utter ruin."[79] But Nālandā was at the height of its glory and progress. Champā and Rājamahal were famous towns of Bihar. Sūrat and Valabhī were important trade centres in Western India. Puṇḍravardhana, Tāmralipti, Samataṭa and Karṇasuvarṇa were the renowned cities of Bengāl. The capital of Kāmarūpa was also in flourishing condition and there were continuous streams and tanks in the towns. There were no big cities in Kāmarūpa. The pilgrim informs us that "the country was a series of hills and hillocks" and it was "without any principal city."[80]

THE ORGANIZATION OF COMMERCIAL GUILDS

We have no direct evidence of any commercial organization but in the literature of the period under review some sidelight is thrown on the nature and organization of the industrial and commercial guilds.[81] Dharmaśāstras like those of Nārada and Bṛihaspati represent that the progressive advancement of the guild organizations continued during this period.[82] These works indicate, in a general way, that very great importance was attached to these organizations as an important factor in the society.[83]

STANDARD OF LIVING

Both Yuan Chuang and Bāṇa give us an identical account of the economic prosperity and a high standard of living among the rich classes at least. The people of Sthāṇviśvara and Ujjayinī are picturesquely described by Bāṇa for their wealth and luxury. Yuan Chuang, too, informs

---

79. *Watters, II, P.* 1.

80. *Ibid., II, Pp.* 185-86.

81. *CA., Pp.* 592-93.

82. *Economic Hist. of Anc. India, The Chapter on the Age of Harṣa, Pp.* 281-88. *Corporate Life in Anc. India., Cal.* 1918, *p.* 14; *Mukherji, Harṣa, P.* 171.

83. *Corporate Life in Ancient India, P.* 14.

us that the greater part of the country enjoyed a good standard of living and high prosperity. His description of various places such as Sthāṇviśvara, Kānyakubja, Vārāṇasī, Puṇḍravardhana, Tāmralipti, Valabhī, Sūrat etc., undoubtedly reveals that the people were wealthy, luxurious, prosperous and happy. The people esteemed learning and observed a high standard of morality. They attached due importance to religious, spritual, aesthetical and cultural aspects of life.

•

INDEX

E

H

I

L

M

N

S

CORRIGENDA

Reference	For	Read
p.31, n.41, 1.1	Vol.	Vol.II,
p.36, 1.9	Harsagupta	Harsaguptā
p.36, n.73, 1.2	nd.,	Ind.,
p.43,1.26	the Devagupta	the Mālvā ruler Devagupta
p.46, 1.17,	Dharatena I	Dharasena I
p.50, 1.14	precptors	preceptor
p.64, n.20, 1.9	musthave	must have
p.66, n.10, 1.1	konow	Konow
p.68, n.2, 1.1	AIC.,	AIG.,
p.68, n.3, 1.6	CR.,	CA.,
p.71, 1.2	sylhet	Sylhet
p.71,1.10	Susthiravarman	Susthitavarman
p.72, 1.13	Setback	set-back
p.77.1.6	district	distinct
p.77, n.7, 1.3	Sarasvatyā	Sarasvatyā)
p.78, 1.4	unintermitteut	unintermittent
p.80, 1.12	"mandarad-like	"mandara-like
p.80, 1.20,	dvst	dust
p.83, 1.18	Puspabhūti	Puṣpabhūtis
p.90, n.64, 1.5	wellknown	well-known
p.94, 1.21	by the	by thy
p.99, 1.9	occeans."	oceans."
p.99, 1.19	gāndharas,	Gāndhāras,
p.105, 1.1	foes'	foes,
p.106, 1.13	campains	campaigns
p.115, 1.5	"It	"it
p.121, 1.8	prineces	princes.
p.123, last line	foregetting	forgetting

p 133, n 19, l 14	Mālā-gauda	Mālvā-Gauda
p 134, l 12	informaed	informed
p 136, l 2	whio	who
p 136, l 11	reffered	referred
p 143, l 14	Leet	feet
p 149, l 13	affilicted	afflicted
p 150, l 3	patheticdc	pathetic
p 154, l 5	ussofar	us so far
p 154, l 17	It	If
p 157, l 6	Buddhism"	Buddhism"
p 176, l 7	countries	countries,
p 181, l 15	bas is	basis
p 181, l 24	Purusued	Pursued
p 184, l 4	commads	commands
p 186, l 7	ascei taind	ascertained
p 204, last line	Butas	But as
p 207, l 12	ins tructions	instructions
p 211, last line	vising	visiting
p 218, l 20	refine	refined
p 221, l 3	Fast	East
p 233, l 24	deen	been
p 235, l 21	porud	proud
p 242, l 3	councilors	councillors
p 244, l 21	sucessful	successful
p 251, n 42, l 9, n 44, l 2	Flect	Fleet
p 252, l 16	evers	ewers
p 260, l 15	councellor	counsellor
p 261, l 11	ettiquate	etiquette
p 265, n 100, l 2	genearl	general
p 270, l 24	herose	heroes
p 281, l 3	also	we also
p 281, last line	authenitcity	authenticity
p 298, l 20	were	mere

p.307, n.43, l.1	persnally	personally
p.314, n.65, l.1	tis	its
p.340, n.69, l.2	occatsions.	occasions.
p.340, n.70, l.2	earlierr	earlier
p.348, l.1	Kādambaīr	Kādambarī
p.377, l.11	dying	dyeing
p.413, l.7	Uan	Yuan
p.430, l.9	in dolent	indolent
p.437, l.14	comig	coming
p.438, l.19	inaugarated	inaugurated
p.438, l.19	auspcious	auspicious
p.448, l.12	deepend	deepened
p.464, l.16	letter	latter
p.468, l.17	seal	seat
p.469, l.11	acount	account
p.479, l.24	inhaibitants	inhabitants
p.481, l.6	of the	on the
p.486, l.5	commerece	commerce
p.489, l.7	Thus	This

Read the following names, wherever they occur, with diacritical marks thus :

Ādityavardhana, Ahichchhatrā, Bhaṇḍi, Bhāskaravarman, Bhīṣma, Grahavarman, Kādambarī, Kaliṅga, Prabhākaravardhana, Puṇyavarman, Rājaśekhara, Rājataraṅgiṇī, Sanyāsa, Yaśodharman, Vātsyāyana.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

ORIGINAL SOURCES ON HARṢA

Bāna's Harṣacharita Ed P. V Kane, First Ed, Bombay, 1918.

Bāna's Harṣacharita Ed Jivananda Vidyasagar, Calcutta, 1892

Bāna's Harṣacharita Ed Fuhrer, Bombay, 1909.

Bāna's Harṣacharita Eka Sāmskritika Adhyayan by V. S Agrawal, Patna, 1953

Bāna's Harṣacharita Tr by E B Cowell and F W Thomas, London, 1897

Bana's Kadambari Ed Peterson, Bombay, 1900

Bana's Kadambari Ed Parab, Bombay, 1896.

Bana's Kadambari Tr by Ridding, London, 1896

Bana's Kadambari Eka Samskritika Adhyayana by V S Agrawal, Varanasi, 1958

Priyadarśikā A Drama in Four Acts by Śri Harsa Ed. by Jivananda Vidyasagar, Calcutta, 1874

Priyadarśikā by Harshadeva with the Commentary of Nivasa Jagannath Svamin, Vizagapatam, 1880.

Priyadarśikā of Śri Harsadeva Ed by Visnu Daji Gadre, Bombay, 1884.

Priyadarśikā with a commentary and Introduction by R V Krishnamachariar, Srirangam, 1906

Priyadarśika A Sanskrit Drama by Harsa (Columbia University Indo-Iranian Series, Vol X) Tr and Ed by Nariman, Jackson, Ogden, New York, 1923

Ratnavalī by Harṣa Ed Parab and Joshi, Bombay, 1888.

Ratnāvali by Harṣa Ed Godbole and Parab, Sec. Ed., Bombay, 1890.

Ratnāvali by Harṣa Ed Joglekar, Bombay, 1913

Ratnāvali by Harṣa Ed Chakravarti, Sec Ed, Calcutta, 1919.

Ratnāvalī by Harṣa Ed Joshi and Watve, Belgaum, 1953

Nāgānanda by Harṣa Ed Brahme and Paranjape, Poona, 1893

Nāgānand by Harṣa : Tr. Palmer Boyd, London, 1872.

Nāgānandaṁ : Ed. and Tr. by Toraskar an Deshpande, Bombay.

CHINESE WORKS

Hsuan Chuang Si-Yu-ki, Buddhist Records of the Western World : Tr. S. Beal, 2 Vols, London, 1906.

Hsuan Chuang : *Life of Hieun-Tsiang* : by Sharman Hwui Li, Tr. S. Beal, New Ed., London, 1911.

On Yuan Chwang's Travels in India (A. D. 629-645) : by Thomas Watters, 2 Vols., London, 1904-5, First Indian Ed. 1961, New Delhi.

INSCRIPTIONS

Banskhera Copper Plate : Ep. Ind., Vol. IV, Pp. 208-211.

Madhuban Copper Plate : Ep. Ind., Vol. I, Pp. 67-75.

Nalanda Seals, Ep. Ind. : Vol. XXI, Pp. 74-6.

Sonpat Seal : CII., Vol. III, No. 52, Pp. 231-232.

MODERN WORKS ON HARṢA

Chatterji, Gaurishanker : Harsavardhana (Indi. Ed.), Allahabad, 1938.

Ettinghausen, Maurice L : Harṣa-Vardhana, empereur et poete de I'Inde Septentrionale, Louvain, 1906.

Mookerji, Radha Kumud : Harsha, Oxford, 1926.

Pannikar, K. M. : Śrī Harsha of Kanauj, Bombay, 1992.

Sampurnanand : Samrāṭa Harshavardhana, (Hindi Ed.), Bombay, 1920.

Tripathi, R. S. : History of Kanauj, Banaras, 1937.

Vaidya, Chintamani Vinayaka : Harṣa and His Times being Vol. I of his History of Medieval Hindu India, Poona, 1921.

SOME IMPORTANT CONTRIBUTIONS

Banarjee, A. C. : 'The Empire of Harṣa ; JAHRS, Vol. VI.

Basak, R. G. : 'Śaśāṅka,' IHQ., III.

Ganguly D. C. : Rajyavardhana and Śaśāṅka, IHQ., XXIII.

Majumdar, R. C. : 'Harṣavardhana A Critical Study, JBORS., IX.

'The Harṣa Era,' IHQ, XXVII.

'Harsha and His Times,' CA.

Ray, N R 'Harshavardhan Śilādıtya A Revısed Study,' IHQ , III

Sharma, B N 'On the Authentıcıty of Harṣa's Authorshıp', Madhya Bharatı, Vol I

'Dramas of Harsa A crıtıcal study' Madhya Bharatı II

'The Early Puṣpabhutıs, 'Madhya Bharatı,' III

Sırcar, D C · 'Evıdence of the Nalanda Seals,' IHQ , XIX

'Harsa's Accessıon and Harsa Era IHQ , XXVII

Trıpathı, R S 'Harsha as Author and Patron of Letter' JBHU I

'On the Extent of Harsa's Empıre', JBHU , II

Vaıdya C V : 'Harsa and Hıs Tımes', JBBRAS , XXIV

ORIGINAL WORKS

Valmıkı Rāmāyana Ed Hemachandra Bhattacharya, Calcutta, 1869-84 North-Western Indıa Ed by Pandıt Rama Labhya and others, Lahore, 1923, Cııtıcal Ed by Raghuvıra, Lahore, 1938, Englısh Tr M N Dutta, Calcutta, 1892 94, Englısh Tr ınto verses by Grıffith, Banaras, 1915

MAHĀBHĀRATA

Mahābhārata, Bom · Ed wıth Commentary of Nılakantha, Ed Kınjawadekar, Poona, 1929 33

Crıtıcal Ed by Sukthankar and Others, Poona, 1927ff, Ed and Tr P C Roy, Cal , 1883 96

PURĀNAS

Agnı Purāna Ed R Mıtra, Cal , 1873-79

Bhavıṣya Purāna Bom Ed., 1910

Brahma Purāna Poona Ed , 1885

Brahmāṇḍa Purāṇa Bom , 1913

Harıvamśa Purāna Ed Kınjawadekar, Poona 1936

Markaṇḍeya Purāna Ed Banarjee, Cal , 1862, Englısh Trans, Pargıter, Cal , 1904

Matsya Purana Poona, 1907

Padma Purāna : Ed Mandlıka, Poona, 1907

Vāyu Purāṇa : Ed. Apte, Poona, 1905.

Viṣṇu Purāṇa : English Trans. H. H. Wilson, Lond., 1864-74.

LEXICONS

Amarsiṁha's Amarakośa, with Commnentaries of Kṣīrasvāmin and Vandyaghaṭīya Sarvānand : Ed. T. Ganapati Sastri, 4 Pts, Trivandrum, 1914-17.

Halāyudha's Abhidhānaratnamālā : Ed. Aufrecht, London, 1861.

Hemachandra's Abhidhāna-Chintā-maṇi : Ed. by Boehtlingk.

Keśava's Kalpadrumkośa : Ed. Pandit Ramavatar Sharma, Baroda, 1928.

Śabdārtharatnasamanvayakośa : Gaikvad Orient. Series, Baroda, 1932.

Śabdakalpadruma of Rājā Rādhākāntadeva : Delhi, Reprint, 1961.

DICTIONARIES

Āpte, Vāman Shivram : The Practical Sanskrit-English Dictionary. Poona, 1890.

Dowson : Hindu Classical Dictionary, 1914.

Monier-Williams : Sanskrit-English Dictionary, 1956 Reprint.

WORKS ON POLITY

Kauṭilya's Arthaśastra : English Translation by Shamasastry, 3rd edition, Mysore, 1929.

Kāmandakīya Nītisāra : Ed. by Ganapati Sastri. Trivandrum, 1912.

Śukra Nītisāra : Ed. G. Oppert, Madras, 1882.
Eng. trans. by M. N. Dutt, Calcutta, 1882.
Eng. trans. by B. K. Sarkar, 2nd. Ed. Allahabad, 1923.

ANCIENT HISTORICAL WORKS

Daṇḍin : Daśakumāra-charita
Ed. by G. Buhler and P. Peterson. Bombay, 1887, 1891.
Ed. with intr., notes, and Eng. trans. by M. R. Kale, 3rd Ed., Bombay, 1926.
Ed. by Narayan Acharya, Bombay, 1951.

Jonarāja : Dvitiya-Rajatarangini, Ed. P. Peterson, Bombay, 1896.

Kalhana Rajatarangini
Ed Durga Prasad, Bombay, 1892
Eng trans by M A Stein, London, 1900
Eng trans by R S Pandit, Allhabad 1935
Vākpati Gauḍavaho
Ed S P Pandit, Bombay, 1887, 2nd Ed by N B Utgikar, Poona, 1927

WORKS ON GRAMMAR

Panini s Aṣṭadhyāyi
Patañjali s Mahabhaṣya Ed by Kielhorn

SMRITIS AND DHARMAŚĀSTRAS

Brihaspati Smriti Ed by A B Fuhrer, Leipzing 1879
Eng trans by J Jolly SBE, Oxford, 1889 Reconstructed by K V Rangaswami Aiyangar, GOS, Baroda, 1941
Dharmaśastra samgraha Ed by J Vidyasagara, 2 Vols, Calcutta 1873
Gautama Dharmaśastra Ed by A F Stenzler, London, 1876
Katyayana-smriti Ed by N C Bandyopadhyaya, Calcutta, 1927
Katyāyana smriti saroddhara (Katyāyana smriti on Vyavahāra, Law and Procedure
Ed with reconstituted text, trans notes and introduction by P V Kane, Bombay, 1933
Smritinam Samuchchaya Poona, 1905
Yajñavalkya-smriti Ed by A F Stenzler Berlin 1849
Ed with the comm Mitakshara, Bombay, 1909
Ed with the comm of Aparaditya, ASS, Poona, 1903-4
Ed with the comm of Viśvarūpa Trivandrum, 1922-4
Eng trans by J R Gharpure, Bombay, 1936 ff

WORKS ON ASTRONOMY

Āryabhaṭa Āryabhaṭiya, with the comm Bhaṭṭadipikā Paramādiśvara Ed by H Kern Leyden, 1874
Eng trans by P C Sen Gupta, JDL, XVI

Sūrya-siddhānta : Ed. by F. E. Hall and B. D. Sastrin, Calcutta, 1859; 2nd Ed., Ed. with the comm. Sudhavarshini by Sudhakara Dvivedi. Calcutta, 1925.

Eng. trans. with notes and appendix, by E. Burgess, New Haven, 1860; Reprint. Calcutta, 1936.

Varāhamihira : *Bṛihaj jātaka* : With an Eng. trans. and notes, by V. Subrahmanya Sastri, Mysore, 1929.

With Bhaṭṭotpāla's comm. Ed. by Sita Rama Jha, Benares, 1934.

Bṛihat-saṁhitā ; Ed. by H. Kern, Calcutta, 1865.

Eng. trans. by H. Kern, JRAS, 1870-1875; Parts 1-5. :pmdpm. 1870-73.

Ed. with Eng. trans. and notes by V. Subrahmanya Sastri and M. Ramakrishna Bhat, 2 Vols., Bangalore, 1947.

Horāśāstra : Eng. trans. by C. Iyer, Madras, 1885.

Pañchasiddhāntikā : Ed. by G. Thibaut and S. Dvivedi, Benares, 1889.

OTHER WORKS

Sanskṛit Poems of Mayūra : Ed. by Quackenbos, Columbia University Series, Vol. IX.

Rājaśekhara's Karpūra-mañjarī : Ed. by Konow and Lanman, Harvard Oriental Series, 1901.

Viddhaśalabhañjikā : Ed. by Jivananda Vidyasagara, Calcutta, 1883.

Viddhaśālabhañjikā : Ed. By B. R. Āpte, Poona, 1886.

Kāvyamīmāṁsā : Ed. by C. D. Dalal and R. A. K. Sastri. Gaekwad's Oriental Series, No. 1,1916.

Padmagupta's Navsāhasāṅkacharita : Ed. by V. S. Islampurkar, Bombay Sanskrit Series, Bombay, 1895.

Mankha's Śrikaṇṭhacharita : Ed. by Durga Prasada and K. P. Parab, Bombay, 1900.

Kānyakubja Mahākāvya : *Vāsavadattā* : Ed. by F. E. Hall, Calcutta, 1859.

Kālidāsa's Mālavikāgnimitra : Ed. by S. P. Pandit, 1889.

Kālidāsa's Meghadūta : Ed. by Hultzsch, London, 1911.

Vallabhadeva's Subhāṣitāvalī : Ed. by Peterson, Bombay, 1886.

Śārṅgadhara's Paddhati : Ed. by Peterson, Bombay Sanskrit Series, No. 37.

Subhāṣitaratna-Bhāṇḍāgāra : Ed. by Parab, Bombay, 1911.

Soddhala's Udayasundarīkathā : Ed. by C. D. Dalal and Krisnamacarya, Gaekwad's Oriental Series, No. 11. Baroda, 1920.

Prasannarāghava : Ed. by Paranjpe and Panse, Poona, 1894.

Mammaṭa's Kāvyaprakāśa : Ed. by Jhalkikara, Bombay, 1921. English Translation by Ganganatha Jha, 1925.

Nāgoji's Kāvyapradīpodyota : Ed. by D. Chandorkar, Poona, 1898.

Maheśvara's Prakāśādarśa :

Maheśvara's Viśvaprakāśa : Bombay, 1911.

Śrīharṣa's Naiṣadhacharita : Ed. by Sivadatta, Bombay, 1919.

Vidyāpati's Puruśaparīkṣā : Edited and Translated by Nerurkar, Bombay, 1914.

Nyāyachandra's Rambhāmañjarī.

Madanavinodanighaṇṭu : Ed. by Jivananda Vidyasagara.

Hemachandra's Kāvyamīmāṁsā : Gaekwad's Oriental Series, 1924.

Mañjuśrīmūlakalpa : Ed. by Ganapati Śāstrī, Trivandrum, 1925.

Vākpati's Gauḍavāho : Ed. by S. P. Pandit, Bombay, 1887.

Rājaśekhara's Prabandhakośa.

Merutuṅga's Prabandhachintāmaṇi : Ed. by Jinavijaya Muni. Śantiniketan, 1933.

GAZETTEERS

Ambala District Gazetteer.

Farrukhabad District Gazetteer.

Imperial Gazetteer of India.

Bombay Gazetteer.

WORKS ON ANCIENT INDIAN GEOGRAPHY

Majumdar Sastri, S. N. : Ancient India as described by Ptolemy, Calcutta, 1927.

Majumdar, S. N. : Cunningham's Ancient Geography of India, Calcutta, 1924.

Dey, N. L. : Geographical Dictionary of Ancient India, Calcutta, 1927.

GENERAL HISTORICAL WORKS

Acharya, P. K. : The Glories of India, Sec. Ed., Allahabad, 1952.

Aiyangar, K. V. R. : Some Aspects of Ancient Indian Polity, Sec. Ed., Madras, 1935.

Aspect of Ancient Indian Economic Thought, Banaras, 1934.

Aiyangar, S. Krishnaswami : Ancient India, 2 Vols., Poona, 1941.

Studies in Gupta History, Madras, 1928.

Some Contributions of South India to Indian Culture, Calcutta, 1927.

Aiyer, C. P. Ramaswamy : Phases of Religion and Culture, Bombay, 1949.

Aiyer, K. V. Subramanya : South Indian Inscriptions, 2 Vols., Madras, 1928-33.

Allan, J. : Catalogue of coins of Ancient India (in the British Museum), London, 1936.

Altekar, A. S. : State and Government in Ancient India, Sec. Ed., Banaras, 1955.

Education in Ancient India, 4th Ed., Barnaras, 1951.

Position of Women in Hindu Civilisation, Banaras, 1938.

Aravamuthan, T. G. : The Kaveri, the Maukharis and the Sangam Age, Madras, 1926.

Bajpai, K. D. : Braja Kā Itihāsa (Hindi), 2 Vols., Mathura, 1955, 1958.

Sagar Through the Ages, Sagar, 1964.

Barnett, L. D. : Hindu Gods and Heroes, London, 1923.

Barth, A. : The Religions of India, Lon., 1882.

Barua, K. L. : History of Kāmarūpa, Vol. I, Shillong, 1933.

Basak, R. G. : History of North-Eastern India, Calcutta, 1934.

Beal, S. : Si-yū-ki. Buddhist Records of the Western World, 2 Vols., London, 1906.

Benarjee, R. D. : The Age of Imperial Guptas, Banaras, 1933.

History of Orissa, Two Vols., Calcutta, 1930-31.

Beni Prasad : The State in Ancient India, Allahabad, 1928.

Bhandarkar, R. G. : A peep into the Early History of India, Bombay, 1920

Vaishnavism, Saivism and other Minor Religious Systems., Ind. Ed., Poona, 1938.

Basham, A. L. : The Wonder that Was India, London, 1954.

Chaklader, H. C. : Social Life in Ancient India, Calcutta, 1929.

Dandekar, R. N. : A History of the Guptas, Poona, 1941.
Das, M. N. : Glimpses of Kalinga History, Calcutta, 1949.
Das, S. K. : Educational System of the Ancient Hindus, Calcutta, 1930.
Dasgupta S. N. and De S. K. : History of Sanskrit Literature, Vol. I, Calcutta, 1947.
Dikshitar, V. R. R. : Hindu Administrative Institutions, Madras, 1929.
Eliot, Sir Charles : Hinduism and Buddhism, 3 Vols., London, 1921.
Farquhar, J. N. : An Outline of the Religious Literature of India, Oxford, 1920.
Frazer, R. W. : Literary History of India, London, 1896.
Gait, E. A. : History of Assam, Sec. Ed. Calcutta, 1926.
Ghoshal, U. N. : History of Hindu Political Theories, London, 1923.
Giles, H. A. : The Travels of Fa-hsien or Record of Buddhistic Kingdoms, Cambridge, 1923.
Gopalachari, K. : Early History of the Andhra Country, Madras, 1941.
Gowen, H. H. : History of Indian Literature, New York, 1931.
Groussets, R. : Civilisation of the East, Sec. Ed., Vol. II (India), London, 1932.
Hass, George, C. O. : The Daśarūpaka, A Treatise on Hindu Dramaturgy by Dhanañjaya, New York.
Hazra, R. C. : Rites and customs, Dacca, 1940.
Heras, H. : Studies in Pallava History, Madras, 1933.
Hopkins, E. Washburn : Epic Mythology, Strassburg, 1915.
Ethics of India, London, 1925.
Hutzsch, E. : South Indian Inscriptions, 3 Vols., Madras, 1890-1929.
Jackson, A. V. W. : Certain Dramatic Elements in Sanskrit Plays with Parallel in the English Drama, 1889.
Time Analysis of Sanskrit Plays : Second Series : The Dramas of Harṣa, JAOS., 1900.
Jain, J. C. : Life in Ancient India as depicted in the Jain Canous, Bombay, 1947.
Karamarkar, A. P. : The Religions of India, Lonavala, 1950.
Jayaswal, K. P. : History of India, Lahore, 1933.
Hindu Polity, Third Ed., Banglore, 1955.
Manu and Yāñjavalkya, Calcutta, 1930.

Jha, Ganganath : Hindu Law in its Sources, Allahabad, 1930.

Jolly, J. : Recht und Sittle, Strassburg, 1896, English Trans. B. K. Ghosh, Hindu Law and Customs, Calcutta, 1928.

Jouveau-Dubreuil, G. : Ancient History of the Deccan tr. V. S. S. Dikshitar, Pondicherry, 1917.

Kane, P. V. : History of Dharmaśāstras, 5 Vols., Poona, 1930-62.
History of Alaṁkara Literature, Sec. Ed., Bombay, 1923.
History of Sanskrit Poetics, 3rd Ed., Bombay, 1951.

Keith, A. B. : Sanskrit Drama, Oxford, 1924,
History of Sanskrit Literature, Oxford, 1928.

Kirkpatrick, Col. : An Account of the Kingdom of Nepal, London, 1811.

Krishnamachari: History of Classical Sanskrit Literature, Madras, 1937.

Krishna, M. H. : Mysore Archaeological Survey Report, 1929.

Law, B. C. : History of Pali Literature, London, 1933.

Legge, J. H. : Records of the Buddhistic Kingdoms, being an Account of the Chinese Monk Fa-hien's Travels, Oxford, 1886.

Macdonell, A. A. : History of Sanskrit Literature, 2 Vols., London, 1900.

Majumdar, R.C. : Corporate Life in Ancient India, Sec. Ed., Calcutta, 1922.
History of Bengal, Vol. I, Dacca, 1943.
The Vākātak-Gupta Age, Lahore, 1946.

Mishra, B. : Orrisa under the Bhauma Kings, Calcutta, 1934.

Mitra, R. L. : Antiquities of Orissa, 2 Vols., Calcutta, 1875-80.

Mookerjee, R. K. : Chandragupta Maurya and His Times, Sec. Ed., Bombay, 1943.
The Gupta Empire, Sec. Ed., Bombay, 1952.
Local Government in Ancient India, Oxford, 1919.
History of Indian Shipping.
Ancient Indian Education, London, 1947.

Moraes, G. M. : The Kadamba Kula, Bom., 1931.

Nath, P. : A Study in the Economic Condition of Ancient India, London, 1929.

Obermiller, E. : History of Buddhism, Heidelburg, 1931.

Pandey, R. B. : Historical and Literary Inscriptions, Varana, 1962.
Prachina Bharata, Varanasi, 1961.

Pargiter, *F E* Purāna Text of the Dynasties of the Kali Age, Oxford, 1913

Patil, *D R* Cultural History from the Vāyu Purāna, Poona, 1946

Phillips, *C A* The Civilisation of the East India, London, 1932

Pires, *E* The Maukharis, Madras, 1934

Raychaudhari, *H C* Political History of Ancient India, 6th Ed, Calcutta, 1952

Phys Davids, *T W* History of Indian Buddhism, London, 1897

Rawlinson, *H G* Intercourse between India and the Western World, Cambridge, 1916

Saletore, R N Life in the Gupta Age, Bom, 1943

Sankalia, *H D* Archaeology of Gujrat, Bom, 1941

Schuyler *M* Bibliography of Sanskrit Drama, New York, 1906

Sircar, *D C* Select Inscriptions, Calcutta, 1942

Shah, *C J* Jainism in Northern India, Bombay, 1920

Sivapadasundaram *S* The Śaiva School of Hinduism, London, 1934

Subba Rao *N S* Economic and Political Conditions in Ancient India, Mysore, 1911

Takakusu, *J A* Record of the Buddhistic Religion as Practised in India and the Malaya Archipelago by I Tsing, Oxford, 1890

Tod Co James Annals and Antiquities of Rajasthan, Ed by W Crooke, Oxford, 1920

Upadhyaya, *B S* Gupta Samrājya ka Itihasa (Hindi), 2 Vols, Allahabad, 1939

A Study of Ancient Indian Inscriptions, Varanasi, 1960

Vankateswara, *S V* Indian Culture through the Age, Vol II, Mysore, 1932

Wales, *H G Q* The Making of Greater India, London, 1951

Warmington, *E H* The Commerce between the Roman Empire and India, Cambridge, 1928.

Yazdani, *G* Ajantā, 3 Vols, London, 1930-46